FINAL REPORT:

EVALUATION OF THE JOBSTART / FUTURE SKILLS PROGRAM

May 1, 2001

Prepared For:

Saskatchewan Department of Post-Secondary
Education and Skills Training

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview of the JobStart/Future Skills (JS/FS) Program

The JobStart/Future Skills (JS/FS) Program supports the education and training needs of trainees, while helping Saskatchewan employers fill new vacancies with suitable employees. This dual focus, on both employers and trainees, defines the program.

The JobStart/Future Skills Program has the following goals:

- provide credited and/or recognized training for unemployed Saskatchewan residents who need job skills to gain employment;
- provide employers with the skilled workers they need to fill new positions;
- help industry, in partnership with communities and training institutions, to identify and address training and employment needs.

Two central features of the program are that training occurs in the workplace, and that training is "credited." Credited training results in a formal recognition of skills learned. This recognition can consist of credits from a college, or a letter from an employer attesting to the fact that the trainee has acquired specific skills. The program has existed since 1995, making it a relatively longstanding labour market training program in Saskatchewan.

Methodology

This evaluation addresses the JobStart/Future Skills Program's effectiveness in providing timely, relevant, and cost-effective training that benefits both employers and trainees. The program aims to produce both short-term effects (i.e., providing classroom or on-the-job training) and long-term benefits to industry and trainees, by emphasizing structured and credited training designed for specific jobs.

Methodologies included key informant interviews (Task 2), a survey of 1,000 trainees (Task 5), a survey of 200 employers (Task 6), a survey of 60 staff (Task 7), and a document and database review.

Main findings

Among provincial training programs, the JobStart/Future Skills Program has satisfied the needs of trainees and employers. It balances economic development with human resource development, and benefits individuals, industry, and the economy as a whole.

Trainees express high levels of satisfaction the JS/FS Program. It has helped people find and maintain employment, and led to increased earnings and self-sufficiency. Most graduates find work immediately upon completion, and increase their earnings in the process. Overall, the

program has also helped people reduce their reliance on Social Assistance and Employment Insurance, and has increased attachment to the labour market.

The JS/FS Program has also met employers' needs. Employers express satisfaction with the way that JS/FS staff tailor training to meet their needs. Some believe it has helped to foster a learning culture in the workplace, as employers are involved in delivering credited training that is more practical to their needs.

The JobStart/Future Skills Program is a useful element of the Saskatchewan training environment. Work-Based Training differs from Community Works and Work Placement, due to its "employer-focus" and emphasis on credited training. Quick Skills trainees come from many streams, with representation from all underrepresented groups. Some would prefer to see greater participation by Social Assistance recipients in the program, and would like to direct employers to hire specific target groups.

Key Findings - Trainees

- *The JS/FS Program helps people find and maintain employment*: Work-Based Training and Re-Training provides trainees with immediate employment, with the hope that they will remain employed once training has ended. Quick Skills is supposed to be provided only in situations where jobs are available and clients are expected to find work immediately upon completion. The trainee survey confirms that the Program meets these goals. Approximately 88% were employed at some point following program completion. Nearly two-thirds (65%) of those in Work-Based Training remained employed at the same job by the actual/expected end of the program. Similarly, 72% of Quick Skills trainees found work within three months of completing their course.

- *The JS/FS Program leads to increased earnings and self-sufficiency:* Increased self-sufficiency is a key measure of a training programs' success. The trainee survey shows that many have benefited financially from training. After training, those who have moved on to other work show distinct increases in wages and salaries. Nearly one-third (31%) report pay increases. As a result, fewer earn under $250 per week, while more earn over $350 per week, or over $10.00 per hour.

  Overall, 84% report being employed at some point after completing training and fewer report receiving Social Assistance (17% were on SAP at some point after training, while 27% were on SAP at some point before training). Similarly, fewer report EI support after training (23%, compared to 40% before training). Additionally, when comparing the 12 months prior to training and the 12 months after training, the average duration of Social Assistance and EI support is lower after training, which may indicate graduates' skills and/or experiences help them find a job more quickly than before training.

- *Access to training differs depending on the type of program:* Quick Skills training is more "client focused," whereas Work-Based Training focuses on the needs of employers. The PTA supports access to Quick Skills training for short-term courses; student loans support longer courses (more than 12 weeks). The PTA enables many Social Assistance clients to access training that they could not otherwise afford. That said, PTA regulations

might make longer-term Quick Skills training less accessible to Social Assistance recipients or other low-income persons who have previously defaulted on loans. These individuals cannot receive the PTA for these courses, creating a potential barrier to participation.

Work-Based Training appears to increase access regionally, but decreases access for underrepresented groups. Individuals from underrepresented groups are said to have more difficulty using Work-Based Training, since the program is primarily employer-driven. Employers may reduce their use of the program if they lose discretion over whom to hire.

Key Findings - Employers

- *JS/FS meets employers' needs.* JS/FS is unlike other wage subsidy programs in its emphasis on providing credited training, which is a strong feature of the program and distinguishes it from other provincial training programs.

- *Employers are generally satisfied with the way that JS/FS staff tailor training to meet their needs.* Most employers report that the program is flexible enough to meet their training needs, and express satisfaction with the process of determining program accreditation.

- *The JS/FS Program has fostered a learning culture.* The training subsidy makes it easier for employers to invest in training, and reduces the risk of hiring untrained persons. The "training subsidy" provides a basis for training that may not have previously existed, thereby contributing to the development of a "learning culture" within industry. The employer survey showed that most employers agree that "the program enabled them to provide more training than normally provided to new employees." The survey of field staff found two-thirds of staff agree, "Work-Based Training helps cultivate a learning culture among employers."

- *A large minority of staff and employers would like to see the return of Work-Based Re-Training.* Over one-third of employers agreed with the statement, "Without the program, we would not have re-trained existing employees," compared to 15% who disagreed, while the rest were neutral or were "not sure." This suggests that some employers view re-training as "optional," and are less likely to upgrade the skills of current employees without financial support. Nearly half (48%) of staff said that the Re-Training program should be brought back, while 27% said the program was beneficial but not necessary. In general, stronger support for re-training exists among Regional Colleges/SIAST staff and industry representatives than among government staff. The former support the programs, because they help employers meet their training needs.

Key Findings - Administration

- *Work Placement and Work-Based Training have different philosophical underpinnings, making them difficult to merge.* Work Placement and Community Works are similar to Work-Based Training, as each offers subsidies to employers. However, the Work-Based Training program emphasizes credited training tailored to the needs of employers, whereas Work Placement and Community Works do not mandate a training component as a condition for support.

- *The JS/FS Program supports local and regional decision-making.* Most key informants agreed that JS/FS has a high degree of local and regional decision making, because SIAST and Regional Colleges deliver it. Nearly half (47%) of field staff consider **regional** decision-making a "very important" part of the JS/FS Program, while 35% consider it "somewhat important." Nearly three-quarters (73%) said that **local** decision-making is "very important," while 13% said it was "somewhat important."

- *In general, field staff support the regional training needs assessments, but recommend improving them.* Over one-quarter (28%) of field staff report that the local/regional training needs assessments are effective, 40% said they need some improvement, while 12% said they require "major improvements." Suggestions for improving the process include more involvement with employers; more involvement from other community stakeholders (e.g., First Nation and Métis organizations, CBOs); streamlined and timely assessments; better synthesis between local, regional, and provincial training needs during planning; and more resources. Most of these comments represent minority positions among respondents, but they do provide a good indication of what some staff recommend to improve the program.

- *Sector partnerships extend partnerships between government, employers, and industry.* Key informants stated that sector partnerships assist the local/regional planning process in the following ways:

  - bringing stakeholders together to discuss concerns and express views;
  - providing information and trends (e.g., sectoral employment rates) that feed into the planning process;
  - focusing on long-term outcomes and the sustainable delivery of programs in a region.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY i

1.0 Introduction 1
- 1.1 JobStart/Future Skills Program's place within the Saskatchewan training environment 1
- 1.2 Purpose of the evaluation 4
- 1.3 Overview of the report 4

2.0 Review of methodology 5
- 2.1 Issues related to the evaluation framework 5

3.0 Rationale 7
- 3.1 Relevancy of the program 7
- 3.2 Use of the program 23

4.0 Success/Impacts/Effects 29
- 4.1 Linkages to work 29
- 4.2 Transitions to training 36
- 4.3 Economic self-sufficiency 38
- 4.4 Key findings - First Nations and Métis persons 42
- 4.5 Key findings - former Social Assistance recipients 43
- 4.6 Certification 44
- 4.7 Reasons for discontinuation 45
- 4.8 Effectiveness of action plans/career counseling 46
- 4.9 Satisfaction with Labour Market Information (LMI) 48
- 4.10 Summary 48

5.0 Program design and delivery 50
- 5.1 Does JS/FS reflect the Saskatchewan Training Strategy? 50
- 5.2 To what extent has JS/FS developed partnerships? 55
- 5.3 How is the program being marketed? 58
- 5.4 Reliance on income support 62
- 5.5 How extensive is local and regional decision-making? 63
- 5.6 How flexible and responsive is the program? 64
- 5.7 How effectively is the program managed? 65
- 5.8 Relationship between SIAST/Regional Colleges and PSEST/CSCES 67
- 5.9 Summary 68

6.0 Best practices and lessons learned 69

APPENDIX A CLIENT SURVEY
APPENDIX B STAFF SURVEY
APPENDIX C KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE
APPENDIX D LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED
APPENDIX E METHODOLOGY
APPENDIX F SECTOR PARTNERSHIPS

1.0 Introduction

1.1 JobStart/Future Skills Program's place within the Saskatchewan training environment

The JobStart/Future Skills (JS/FS) Program supports the education and training needs of trainees, while helping Saskatchewan employers fill new jobs with suitable employees. This dual focus on both employers and trainees defines the program.

The goals of the JobStart/Future Skills Program are to:

- provide credited and/or recognized training for unemployed Saskatchewan residents who need job skills to gain employment;
- provide employers with the skilled workers they need to fill new positions;
- help industry, in partnership with communities and training institutions, to identify and address training and employment needs.

The program has existed since 1995, making it a relatively longstanding labour market training program.

The JS/FS Program provides an array of training options that allow for individual choice. Depending on the training stream selected by employers and employees, different parts of the post-secondary system take the lead. SIAST / Regional Colleges typically deliver programs through the workplace, while PSEST has overall responsibility for the Sector Partnerships Program.

The collaborative nature of JS/FS addresses a wide range of labour market needs. Some provincial programs complement JS/FS (e.g., Bridging), while others (e.g., Work Placement and Community Works) appear to overlap. In reality, JS/FS possesses several important features that increase its usefulness as an element of Saskatchewan Training Strategy.

1.1.1 Program overview

The JS/FS Program includes three main components: Work-Based Training, Institutional Training, and Sector Partnerships.

Work-Based Training: The JS/FS Program encourages industry, training providers, and government to recognise Work-Based Training as a viable alternative to classroom-based training. This component partners Post-Secondary Education and Skills Training, Regional Colleges, and SIAST with local businesses to deliver training within the workplace targeted to the unemployed.

- *Work-Based Training for the Unemployed* subsidizes employers who create jobs and provide credited/industry-recognized training for unemployed persons. This training equips trainees with a portable set of skills leading to full-time employment that meets the needs of industry. The program funds up to 50% of approved training costs (such as employee/trainee wages, instructor salaries and benefits, materials, supplies, and classroom training costs, if applicable).[1] Exemptions from the maximums are possible, depending on the type of project and employer. JS/FS encourages the participation of youth, women, First Nations and Métis peoples, people with disabilities, visible minorities, and/or Social Assistance recipients.

- *Work-Based Training for Employed* subsidized employer training of current employees. The program provided opportunities for employees to retrain to meet new skill needs, thereby helping businesses to remain competitive, fostering economic growth and creating jobs. The Program covers up to one-third of approved training costs,[2] subject to maximums dictated by firm size, and whether the trainee faced layoff. ***This program, discontinued in April 2000, remains part of the evaluation.***

Institutional Training: The JobStart/Future Skills Program also supports funding for Institutional Quick Response Training. This includes medium (one year) and short-term (1-20 weeks) training for growth sectors in the economy. Classroom-based programs include the Saskatchewan Skills Extension Program and the Quick Skills Program. Both programs are typically offered through the province's public training institutions

---

1 This is to a maximum of $5,000 per employee and $100,000 per employer.

2 These can include external instructor or in-house instructor costs, wages of employees removed from production, materials, facility and equipment rentals, tuition, and travel/accommodations for offsite training of staff or instructors.

(SIAST, Regional Colleges, Dumont Technical Institute). The Institutional Quick Response component encourages the inclusion of groups that are traditionally under-represented in training, including youth, women in non-traditional jobs, First Nations and Métis peoples, people with disabilities, visible minorities, and Social Assistance recipients.

- *Institutional Quick Response Training - Saskatchewan Skills Extension Program (SSEP)* provides funding to the regional colleges and Dumont Technical Institute to deliver accredited training (of up to one year in duration) in rural areas of the province. SSEP addresses the labour market training needs of rural and northern residents. It focuses on the education and training needs of business, industry, government, and the community, and involves them in planning, delivery, and accountability processes.

- *Institutional Quick Response Training - Quick Skills* funds short-term accredited training provided by public training institutions, allowing new jobs in the industry to be filled by skilled workers. The Program encourages participation of underrepresented groups, and seeks partnerships among training institutions, industry organizations, employers, and communities to prepare unemployed persons for jobs in the local economy.

Sector Partnerships Program: This component of JS/FS assists industry sectors in establishing partnerships with the private sector, training providers, and community stakeholders to develop strategic human resource plans that address industry's human resource needs. The Sector Partnerships Program brings together industry associations, community groups, and trainers to develop training strategies, identify potential growth areas, and cultivate continuous learning within the workplace. The program also supports the development of linkages with Métis people, First Nations peoples, and labour organizations to ensure their involvement in industry training and employment strategies.

Up to $50,000 in provincial funding is available for strategic planning to industry associations, councils, organizations, or other representative industry bodies where the partners work together to identify and address common human resource and skills training needs. Partnership proposals that receive priority include:

- sectors that are important to the province's ability to compete in external markets;
- long-term approaches to strategic human resource planning;
- partnerships with geographic and communities of interest, including First Nations and Métis; and
- those that contribute cash or in-kind support to the project.

Sector Partnerships are a strategic response for addressing the human resource needs of the province or region, and for developing partnerships with industry and community-based organizations. Previously identified "sectors" include Forestry, Health, Agriculture, Agriforestry, Environment and Information Technology.

1.2 Purpose of the evaluation

PSEST designed the Program to produce both short-term effects (i.e., providing classroom or on-the-job training) and long-term benefits to industry and trainees, by emphasizing structured and credited training designed for specific jobs. This evaluation reviews the JobStart/Future Skills Program's effectiveness in providing timely, relevant, and cost-effective training that benefits both employers and trainees.

1.3 Overview of the report

This report contains the following sections:

- Section 2 reviews the evaluation framework and methodology used to conduct this study.
- Section 3 addresses program rationale, including relevancy and utilization.
- Section 4 examines program outcomes. Key indicators include transition to work, transition to training, and employer and trainee satisfaction.
- Section 5 reviews program design and delivery. Key issues include the fulfillment of program goals, the complementary relationship among JS/FS and other training programs, the extent of management effectiveness, and the development of partnerships.
- Section 6 offers concluding observations.

2.0 Review of methodology

2.1 Issues related to the evaluation framework

Table 1 below presents the methodology used to evaluate the program, as outlined in the methodology report.

Task[1]	Description	Details
2	Document, database, and administrative file review	Review of trainee and employer databases provided by SIAST. Review of program documents (Saskatchewan Training Strategy, Quick Skills Program, PTA guidelines, JS/FS background). Discussion with PSEST staff about Sector Plan and program files.
3	Key informant interviews	Interviews with 24 key informants (12 from PSEST / Regional Colleges, 7 industry representatives, and 5 from PSEST/CSCES).
4	Methodology reporting	Report submitted.
5	Survey of trainees	Telephone survey of 1,008 trainees. Trainees included 447 in Work-Based Training, 149 in Work-Based Re-Training, and 442 in Quick Skills (some participated in multiple programs).
6	Employers survey	Sample: 196 of 404 (49% response rate) – mail survey.
7	Staff surveys	Sample: 60 of 105 (57% response rate) – mail survey.
8	Reporting	Draft report.
Note: Task 1 is an initial planning and consultation		

The following qualifiers influenced the application of data / methodologies used in the analysis:

- *Reliance on trainee survey to identify EI and SA participation*: The database provided by PSEST does not contain SA or EI information on clients, and an extract of provincial databases was both too time-consuming and beyond the available resources. Therefore, self-report data from the trainee survey forms a key information source to identify SA and EI involvement pre- and post-training. Self-report data is a weaker line of evidence than administrative data.

- *Databases contain incomplete client information, and do not provide a complete picture of all trainees.* SIAST tracks information on those students who participate in Quick Skills training or SIAST-credited Work-Based Training. Records were not available for most Re-Training trainees and some Work-Based Training trainees. We have relied on the trainee survey to provide demographic information.

- *Those who graduated from JS/FS programs prior to 1997 were harder to contact, as many had moved.* PRA used on-line directory assistance to track individuals who could not be contacted at the listed phone number. Still, many former program trainees could not be contacted, potentially biasing results to reflect the experiences and outcomes of more recent trainees.

- *Some trainees failed to recognize the JobStart/Future Skills Program by name.* PRA interviewers reported that many trainees said they had never heard of the JobStart/Future Skills Program. Providing clients with a reference period and course name helped trainees to comment on the "program," which meant they were commenting on their experiences while in the course or while training on-the-job. Trainees are commonly unaware of the formal name of their training program.

- *The employer survey represents only those who participated in Work-Based Training and Re-Training.* Employers who hired Quick Skills graduates are not contactable, as they are not contained in the database.

Despite these qualifications, the results of the evaluation are clear: many employers and trainees support the results of the program and how it is delivered. It is clear that the JS/FS fills an important role in the Saskatchewan training environment.

3.0 Rationale

This section explores whether JS/FS fills a need within the provincial training environment.

3.1 Relevancy of the program

The degree to which a program meets the needs of those it serves is an important measure of a program's value. In the case of JS/FS programs, clients include both trainees and employers. The program also builds partnerships between government, employers/industry, and training deliverers, to develop an effective and sustainable training environment.

As we show below, JS/FS successfully meets the needs of trainees and employers. Despite being an "employer-driven" program, trainees value their training because it helps them find work and become increasingly self-sufficient. Employers also reported benefits from the training subsidies, increased competitiveness, and an ability to fill vacant positions.

It is much harder to determine whether "community" needs are being met, as this requires identifying who is included in the definition of "community." During interviews, key informants typically considered community-based organizations (CBOs) and government agencies (such as CSCES) as representatives for the abstract concept of "community". With this definition in mind, key informants report that CBOs have not been used to deliver JS/FS training. Instead, the development of partnerships and consultations with industry representatives and community-based organizations through the regional training needs assessment process have strengthened ties and brought regional planning issues to the forefront.

Unlike work placement programs that provide unemployed persons with a job, JS/FS also includes training that results in a credited skill, thereby increasing the mobility of the trainee. Although this may seem not to benefit employers, by increasing the skill levels of workers generally, all of Saskatchewan industry benefits. In other words, mobile workers with higher skills increase the efficiency of the Saskatchewan labour market.

3.1.1 Needs of Individuals (trainees)

Based on the opinions of trainees, staff and key informants, the JobStart/Future Skills Program meets the needs of trainees. Although some trainees may not recognize the JS/FS Program itself, they value the training that they received under the program.[3]

According to the surveys of trainees and employers and interviews with key informants, program success appears to be based on six factors:

1) Training leads to employment either immediately or in the short-term.

2) Training provides valuable skills in the short-term, as well as contributing to long-term skill development.

3) Providing "credited" training appears to improve mobility of trainees within the industry and province.

4) Trainees see the training as practical, whether provided in the workplace or in the classroom. They also find the training material to be relevant and applicable to the workplace.

5) Training helps individuals become more self-sufficient (i.e., increased wages, decreased reliance on Social Assistance and/or Employment Insurance, and improved future job prospects).

6) The variety of delivery methods (Work-Based Training, classroom-based training, distance learning) appears to improve access, particularly for those in rural areas.

Training leads to employment either immediately or in the short-term (within three months)

The JS/FS Program has a stronger focus on "sustainable" employment than other government training programs, though Work Placements and Community Works are moving in the same direction. By definition, Work-Based Training and Re-Training provide trainees with immediate employment, with the expectation that they will remain employed once training has ended.[4] Quick Skills is supposed to be provided only in situations where jobs are available and clients are expected to find work immediately upon completion.

---

3 This perception is based on reports by interviewers who spoke with clients during the trainee phone survey.

4 To receive the training subsidy, employers must hire an unemployed person.

The trainee survey confirms that these goals are being met.

- About 65% of those in Work-Based Training remain employed at the same job by the actual/expected end of the program. Approximately 27% report working for more than one employer following program completion[5].

- Overall, 63% of Work-Based Training trainees report working for one employer, and 27% report working for more than one employer. 10% were enrolled in further training at the time of the survey or did not find work.

- About 85% of those in Work-Based Re-Training worked only with the employer that provided the re-training. The remaining 15% worked with more than one employer.

- Almost three-quarters (72%) of Quick Skills trainees found work within **three months** of completing their course.

- When viewing the entire post-program period, 28% of Quick Skills trainees worked with more than one employer, 54% worked with only one employer, while 18% report no employment as they were either currently enrolled in training or could not find work.

- Sixty-one percent (61%) of clients agreed with the statement, "The training has made it easier to find work or improved your position in the company," while 29% disagreed, and 11% were unsure. Perceptions differed across programs: 68% of Quick Skills trainees reported that it was "easier to find work or improve their position in the company" (agree or strongly agree), compared to 57% of those in Work-Based Training and 50% of those in Re-Training.

Key informants and field staff also support these perceptions:

- As noted in Table 2 (next page), 53% of staff agreed with the statement, "SIAST/Regional College staff have identified potential employers prior to training."[6]

- A smaller proportion (29%) agreed with the statement, "Most Quick Skills trainees have identified potential employers prior to training", while 30% disagreed. This suggests that SIAST/Regional

---

5 Respondents were asked whether they were employed with someone other than the employer from whom they received on the job-training or for whom they had worked immediately after completing a Quick Skills course. This additional employment could be subsequent to or concurrent with their post-program employment.

6 This claim is based on staff opinion, not a file review, and applies only to Quick Skills training.

College staff are developing linkages prior to offering courses/classes. This perception is borne out by the high proportion of graduates (72%) who reported they found work shortly after completing their training.

- More generally, 60% of staff agreed, "Quick Skills trainees are well positioned to find work following course completion." (See Table 2). A slightly higher proportion (69%) reported that Work-Based trainees are well positioned to maintain employment after program completion. Field staff stressed the close linkage between Quick Skills training and employment, and cited this as the main strength of the program.

- Key informants also report that training is provided in areas where there is a market demand for skills, which leads to employment and a high success rate for the program (n=8).

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not sure/ NR
Most Quick Skills trainees have identified potential employers prior to training	2%	27%	18%	27%	3%	23%
SIAST/Regional Colleges have identified potential employers prior to training	8%	45%	12%	13%	-	22%
Quick Skills trainees are well positioned to find work following course completion	8%	52%	13%	5%	-	22%
Work-Based trainees are well positioned to find work following course completion	17%	52%	17%	3%	-	12%

Note: Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
Source: Survey of staff.

Training provides valuable skills in the short-term, as well as contributing to long-term skill development

The JS/FS Program emphasizes training and skill development as a core component separating it from similar "wage-subsidy" programs (e.g., Community Works, Work Placement). The support received by employers is termed a "training subsidy" rather than a "work subsidy," as employers are required to provide training at the workplace that is accredited by either industry or SIAST. This emphasis on credited training is intended to foster both short-term skill development (i.e., enabling trainees to find work immediately) and long-term development

(certification helps trainees develop a "career" or leads to a professional designation).

Trainees report that their skills have increased as a result of the program, assisting them immediately following training and in long-term career development.

- Eighty-seven percent (87%) of trainees agreed with the statement, "The training I received provided me with valuable skills for the job I was training for."
- A slightly smaller proportion (78%) agreed with the statement, "The training I received provided me with valuable skills for my long-term career path."
- Quick Skills trainees were more likely to "strongly agree" with the statement that training "provided valuable skills for long-term skills development" (50% strongly agreed, compared to 40% for Re-Training and 35% for Work-Based Training).
- Eighty-five percent (85%) of trainees agreed that their skills "have increased as a result of the training they received." This perception is held most strongly by Quick Skills trainees (60% strongly agreed, compared to 50% for Work-Based Training and 44% for Re-Training).
- When asked what could be improved about the program, half (50%) had no suggestions for improvement. That said, several noted a need to improve the comprehensiveness and quality of course material, or to provide more "hands-on" experience (14%). Others said that the quality of workplace instruction/supervision (12%) or the quality of classroom instruction (6%) should be improved.
- By contrast, 18% of trainees cited the comprehensiveness and quality of course material or "hands-on" experience as one of the strengths of the program, while 13% cited the quality of workplace instruction/supervision.
- Key informants suggest providing more "train the trainer" courses to teach employers how to provide effective training, particularly when they have little training experience.
- Field staff also suggested JS/FS contributes to short and long-term skill development. In particular, the Work-Based Training (WBT) program is said to be a stepping-stone towards long-term goals, especially when certification is provided.

Providing credited training is said to improve mobility for trainees within the industry

Certification is a key element of the JS/FS Program, though key informants and field staff see it mainly as a benefit for trainees, rather than employers. While the employer who trained the worker "loses" when the trainee changes jobs, the employer who hires a trained worker gains a skilled employee. No net loss occurs to the provincial economy, provided that the worker remains in the province. Moreover, the overall efficiency of the provincial labour market is improved.

- According to key informants, other employers (both within and outside the province) recognize the degree/certificate, thus increasing the mobility of individuals (n=8).

- Most (91%) field staff said that providing credited training was an important characteristic of the program. This perception was also reflected when field staff cited strengths of the Quick Skills and WBT programs. Specifically, they stated that certification provides a tangible record of student accomplishment, and documentation that industry will recognize.

Training is practical, whether provided in the workplace or in the classroom

According to key informants and field staff, Work-Based Training provides valuable practical experience for trainees. Training approaches are tailored to the student, and working/learning on the job ensures that the skills learned are valuable to both employer and employee. A perception exists among staff that no "wasted" training occurs, as skills are developed with a specific application in mind.

Trainees echo these comments. When asked to identify the main strengths of the program, 34% of trainees said that, "training was practical," while 31% said they had a "good work experience." Successful program outcomes (job retention, finding work upon completion of training) also reflect the practical nature of the training.

Some key informants noted that trainees in Quick Skills courses and Work-Based Training lose information provided in longer classroom-based courses. According to several key informants, shortened training may limit the value of the program to the trainee. In many cases, trainees receive an abbreviated training course, and could miss out on what is available in a longer program (n=4). Some field staff reiterated this concern when asked how Quick Skills training could be improved.

Twelve percent (12%) of trainees said that increasing the training period would improve the program. Most of these trainees were enrolled in Quick Skills programs.

Challenges exist in balancing longer-term skill development in the classroom and practical quick training. This concern with course length may be partially due to the fact that Quick Skills attracts many Social Assistance recipients, who are often multi-barriered and may require additional Life Skills / Bridging courses to make an effective transition to the workforce. Some field staff and key informants suggested that certain trainees might benefit from longer training. Specifically, the "quick" skills emphasis may pose a barrier to those lacking a Bridging or Pre-employment program. Ensuring that those directed to a training program are ready to benefit from such an intervention requires careful screening.

Training helps individuals become more self-sufficient

Trainees derive immediate benefits from Work-Based Training, as they simultaneously earn money from employment and receive training, and do not require/receive student loans or other forms of income support. Trainees who retain full-time employment at the end of the subsidy period should be self-sufficient, reflecting a key measure of program success.

Conversely, many Quick Skills trainees require income support (Provincial Training Allowance, Skills Training Benefit, EI benefits, student loans) while in training. With the exception of student loans, JS/FS trainees do not accumulate debt to cover training costs. Those who make the transition to work, and do not return to Social Assistance upon completion, can also be said to benefit from the training.

The trainee survey shows that many have financially benefited from training. Trainees who have moved on to other work after training show distinct increases in wages and salaries; nearly one-third (31%) report pay increases. Few earn under $250 per week, and many earn over $350 per week, or over $10.00 per hour (see Section 4.3).

- Nearly half (49%) of trainees agreed with the statement, "My average annual earnings have increased as a result of the JS/FS Program," while a similar proportion (46%) disagreed.

- Quick Skills (29%) and Work-Based Training (24%) trainees were more likely to strongly agree with this statement, compared to Re-Training trainees (17% strongly agreed).

Overall, slightly more people report employment after training (84%) than before (81%), and fewer report receiving Social Assistance after training (17%, compared to 27% before) or EI support after training (23%,

compared to 40% before). Additionally, when comparing the 12 months prior to training and the 12 months after training, the average duration of Social Assistance or EI support is lower after training, which may indicate graduates' skills and/or experience help them find a job more quickly than before. Section 4 presents a full description of program outcomes.

Access to training is increased

Access to training varies by type of program. Quick Skills training tends to be "client-focused," whereas Work-Based Training focuses on meeting the vacancies of employers. The PTA provides income support to eligible Quick Skills trainees, while student loans are available for those in longer classes (more than 20 weeks). The PTA enables many Social Assistance clients to access training that they could not otherwise afford. That said, PTA regulations make longer-term Quick Skills training inaccessible to many Social Assistance recipients or other low-income persons who have previously defaulted on loans and these individuals cannot receive the PTA for these courses, creating a barrier to participation according to some key informants (n=3). Field staff opinion is divided on this issue, as some cite increased access for low-income unemployed people, but also limited access for longer-term training.

According to several key informants, Work-Based Training increases regional access, since training is delivered at the work-site. This enables rural employers to train individuals locally, rather than having them leave to take training. Some key informants suggest that Work-Based Training improves access for youth and First Nation and Métis trainees, as many live in northern/remote communities.

Several key informants indicated that individuals from underrepresented groups have more difficulty using Work-Based Training, as the program is primarily employer-driven. According to some field staff, this is not necessarily a problem. Some field staff would like to see access increased for Social Assistance recipients (35%), persons with disabilities (35%), and First Nations and Métis trainees (27% and 25%). EI clients are said to have good access to training, as only 2% of field staff said that they were underrepresented.

Observation: Although some staff would like to see more hiring / training of SA and EI clients, most support the program as designed. Most (90%) field staff said, "giving employers the ability to decide who to hire" is an important or very important aspect of the program.

Also, employers need to retain discretion over whom they select. Changing the rules of selection could lessen the attractiveness of the program to employers.

3.1.2 In general, the program appears to meet trainees' needs

Overall, trainees are very satisfied with the program. Eighty-seven percent (87%) of trainees agreed or strongly agree with the statement, "I am satisfied with the JS/FS Program."

Quick Skills trainees were most satisfied with JS/FS training (60% strongly agreed). Over half (54%) of Re-Training trainees and 50% of Work-Based Training trainees strongly agreed that they were satisfied. As noted in Section 4.3, Quick Skills students are more likely to have been on Social Assistance, unemployed, or working at lower wages prior to the program than other trainees. Therefore, Quick Skills students have the most to gain from the program, while Re-Training trainees have the least to gain, as they were already employed and receiving a relatively higher wage prior to the program.

Staff also report that the program has been successful: over half (57%) of staff said that Quick Skills training meets clients' needs (27% disagreed, 17% were not sure), while 65% said that Work-Based Training meets clients' needs (23% disagreed, 12% were not sure).

3.1.3 Needs of employers/industry

JS/FS primarily helps employers find skilled workers and improve business competitiveness. This differs from more "client-driven" programs such as Bridging, Work Placement, or Community Works, which often target underrepresented groups (particularly Social Assistance recipients) to help them increase their self-sufficiency. Although JS/FS also serves those from underrepresented groups, the priority is to help employers find vacancies for skilled workers.

Based on the opinions of employers, trainees, staff and key informants, the JS/FS meets the needs of employers. Most employers (86%) said they were satisfied with the program, and 89% said that they would use the program again. When asked to rate both the Quick Skills and Work-Based Training components of the JS/FS Program, 75% said that Quick Skills training meets employers' needs, while 73% said that Work-Based Training meets employers' needs.

Based on surveys of employers, trainees and staff, and key informant interviews, five factors appear contribute to employer satisfaction:

1) Training subsidies enable employers to meet their need for skilled workers.
2) Subsidizing training increases competitiveness and helps employers adapt to changes within their business/industry.

3) Tailored training meets the needs of employers and trainees.

4) Focus on credited learning helps raise industry standards.

5) The program supports a "learning culture" among employers.

Employers are supported through training subsidies, enabling them to hire individuals to meet their need for skilled workers:

Based on the employer survey, employers appreciate the discretion they are given regarding hiring decisions.

- Approximately one-third (32%) of employers agreed with the statement, "Without the program, we would not have hired a new employee," while 28% disagreed. This split opinion suggests that some would have hired without the training subsidy to meet a need. It also suggests that the training subsidy may encourage an employer to "create" a new position to meet a future need.

- Sixty-eight percent (68%) rated the training subsidy as "a very important part of the JS/FS Program." A similar proportion (67%) report that it was "very important" for them to "have the ability to decide who to hire."[7]

- Over half (53%) of employers report difficulty "finding new employees prior to using the program," while 24% had "some" difficulty. This suggests that the JS/FS Program improves the operation of the labour market.

- Most employers were satisfied with the amount of the training subsidy (86% rated it as "acceptable" or "very acceptable") and with the duration of the training period (84%).

Program regulations specify that employers must cover at least 50% of training costs as negotiated during the proposal phase. Data from the employer survey shows that 62% of employers provide up to $5,000 (per employee) for training, matching the maximum government contribution; 18% of employers spent between $5,000 and $10,000 on training, while 13% reported spending more than $10,000. These figures appear low, since employers are required to provide an average of at least $5,000 in support to match the average training subsidy amount.

---

7 Employers were asked to rate a range of program characteristics along a 3-point scale (3=very important, 2=nice to have, 1=not needed).

Response	WBT	RT	Overall
$0 to $2,500	44%	25%	36%
$2,500 to $5,000	26%	25%	26%
$5,000 to $7,500	11%	14%	12%
$7,500 to $10,000	7%	8%	6%
More than $10,000	7%	21%	13%
Don't know/No response	7%	6%	6%

Note: Totals may not sum to100% due to rounding.
Source: Survey of employers.

In the opinion of field staff, employers are adequately supported in training.

- Most (90%) field staff said, "giving employers the ability to decide who to hire" is an *important* or *very important* aspect of the program.
- Over three-quarters (77%) of field staff report that "employers receive sufficient financial support to provide Work-Based Training."
- Approximately 60% of field staff believe that the maximum training subsidies per employee ($5,000) and per employer ($100,000) are acceptable at existing levels.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not sure/ NR
Employers receive sufficient financial support to provide WBT	30%	47%	12%	-	-	12%
WBT subsidies per trainee should not be set at a fixed maximum amount ($5,000)	2%	17%	7%	50%	15%	10%
WBT subsidies per employer should not be set at a fixed maximum amount ($100,000)	3%	13%	15%	35%	23%	10%

Note: Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
Source: Survey of staff.

Few staff and managers questioned the need for maximum allowances. One claimed that employer training needs vary, and some would choose not to participate, given the current rates. That said, most felt that the subsidy levels are sufficient, and reported hearing few complaints from employers to indicate otherwise.

Subsidized training increases competitiveness and help employers adapt to changes within their business/industry

Employers credit the JS/FS Program with increasing their productivity, competitiveness, and ability to expand.

- Eighty percent (80%) of employers agreed, "Training employees through the program improved the company's productivity."
- Forty-two percent (42%) of employers agreed that "training employees through the program enabled them to expand", while an additional 31% were neutral; 12% disagreed.
- Approximately half of the employers surveyed (48%) agreed that "the program had made them more competitive." Nearly one-third (29%) were neutral on this subject, suggesting that competitiveness neither increased nor decreased.

[redacted] rate the impact that the JobStart/Future Skills Program has had on your company. Using a scale of 1 to 5, indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements: (n=198)

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	NA/DK	Mean
Training employees through the program improved the company's productivity	25%	55%	14%	3%	3%	2%	4.0
Training employees through the program enabled the company to expand	17%	26%	31%	8%	4%	14%	3.5
Training employees through the program has made the company more competitive	14%	34%	29%	8%	3%	12%	3.6

Note: Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
Source: Survey of employers.

Three-quarters (75%) of field staff agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "Quick Skills courses reflect industry demand." A slightly smaller proportion (65%) said that Quick Skills courses are being offered in the right industry sectors.

[redacted] following statements:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not sure/ NR
Quick Skills courses reflect industry demand	18%	57%	8%	2%	-	15%
Quick Skills courses are being offered in the right industry sectors	10%	55%	10%	3%	-	22%

Note: Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
Source: Survey of staff.

Training is tailored to the meet the needs of employers and trainees

The JS/FS Program emphasizes the provision of credited training, unlike other wage subsidy programs. Prior to the program, most training was delivered in the classroom, with little on-the-job training.

At the outset of the program, the department requested that SIAST adapt existing curricula and develop training modules for industries lacking "standards." Several key informants claimed that some SIAST staff resisted this change, which would locate training outside the institution. Even those who supported it were said to have had difficulty adjusting to this new mode of program delivery, where materials needed revision to meet employers' needs.

Several key informants claim that SIAST has improved its responsiveness and is now supporting the program. Developing new modules still requires effort, and some key informants noted that the process of credited training within industry is not always practical. These individuals argued that providing credited training should not prevent employers from accessing the program.

Employers are generally satisfied with the way that JS/FS staff tailor training to meet their needs. When asked to identify strengths of the program, 26% cited the "flexibility of the program (e.g., designing their own training program). A somewhat smaller proportion (14%) noted that the "helpfulness of staff" was one of the programs strengths.

- Approximately three-quarters (76%) said, "support from program staff to develop training proposals" was "very acceptable" or "acceptable" (see Table 7 below).
- Eighty-three percent (83%) reported the program was flexible enough "to meet their training needs" ("very acceptable" or "acceptable").
- About three-quarters (76%) were satisfied with the speed at which program applications are processed, while 80% found the "administrative requirements of the program" to be "very acceptable" or "acceptable".
- Over half (57%) said the process of "determining training accreditation with industry and SIAST" was "acceptable" or "very acceptable". A minority (15%) had little experience with this process, and chose not to respond.

	Very acceptable	Acceptable	Neutral	Unacceptable	Very unacceptable	DK/NR
Support from program staff to develop the training proposal	29%	47%	16%	5%	1%	3%
Flexibility of the program to meet your training needs	24%	59%	12%	4%	2%	1%
Quick processing of program application	23%	53%	17%	5%	1%	2%
Quality of the training material	17%	58%	17%	1%	4%	5%
Administrative requirements of the program	13%	67%	16%	3%	1%	1%
Determining training accreditation with industry and SIAST	10%	47%	24%	4%	1%	15%

Note: Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
Source: Survey of employers.

Employers also rated the importance of several program components.

- Nearly two-thirds (65%) of respondents said "quick processing of program applications" was "very important", while 74% rate "flexibility to design a training program to meet your training needs" as "very important".
- Over half (57%) said, "having support from staff to develop the training proposal" is "very important".

These results show the importance of negotiation in developing programs to meet the needs of trainees and employers.

Statement	Very important	Nice to have	Not needed	DK/NR
Quick processing of program application	65%	31%	-	4%
Flexibility to design a training program to meet your training needs	74%	21%	2%	3%
Having support from staff to develop the training proposal	57%	35%	5%	3%

Note: Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
Source: Survey of employers.

Focus on credited learning helps develop industry standards

Credited training benefits both trainees and employers. For trainees, it provides certification of specific skills, offering greater labour market mobility. For employers, credited training helps establish industry

standards, and potentially provides a competitive advantage for the industry against other companies from other provinces or countries.

- Nearly half (47%) of employers said "providing training that is credited" is very important, while 39% said that this component is "nice to have" but not essential.

- Field staff also support the process of providing credit for training. Three-quarters (75%) of field staff agree with the statement, "Providing credit for Work-Based Training is important."

While both employers and staff support credited training, most staff and managers view it as more advantageous to trainees than employers.

The program supports a "learning culture" among employers

According to key informants, the training subsidy makes it easier for employers to make an investment in training, and reduces the risk in hiring untrained persons. Some staff also think that the Program offers a basis for training that may not have previously existed, contributing to the development of a "learning culture" within industry (key informants, n=6).

The employer and field staff surveys reflect these sentiments:

- Over three-quarters (78%) of employers agreed "that the program enabled them to provide more training than normally provided to new employees."

- Two-thirds (66%) of field staff said, "Work-Based Training helps cultivate a learning culture among employers." Only 14% of field staff disagreed with the statement.

That said, both staff and employers are disappointed by the cancellation of the Work-Based Re-Training component.

- Thirty-eight percent (38%) of employers agreed with the statement, "Without the program, we would not have re-trained existing employees," compared to 15% who disagreed. This suggests a higher proportion of employers view re-training as "optional", and are less likely to upgrade the skills of current employees without financial support.

- Nearly half (48%) of staff said that the Re-Training program should be brought back, while 27% said the program was beneficial but not necessary. Only 17% said the program was not needed, while the remainder did not respond.

- According to several key informants (n=11), the cancellation of Work-Based Re-Training has created a gap in the training spectrum, although others felt the program would not be missed (n=5). Some called the cancellation a "step back," representing a retrenchment of the commitment to develop a learning culture within industry.

- A few key informants cited minimal reaction from employers, although two added the caveat that many employers did not know of the program's existence, and therefore would not miss it.

These two perspectives on the Re-Training program (as reported by key informants) reflect a difference in principle. Industry representatives supported the program, as it helped employers meet their training needs. Some service providers favoured the program, because it provided training opportunities and its cancellation meant the cancellation of training courses. Other service providers and government representatives claimed that with limited funds, re-training had the lowest priority. They said that employers are expected to commit money to train their existing employees and do not require government support. Other key informants noted the difficulty of measuring the impact of re-training, because it does not create new jobs, rather being intended to increase competitiveness and productivity, and help employers adjust to change.

Although the Re-Training program was popular, the arguments against its reintroduction are also valid. The option has a lower priority among managers compared to SIAST / Regional College staff and employers.

3.1.4 Needs of community

The term "community" is hard to define. Key informants typically considered CBOs and government agencies (such as CSCES) to be representatives for the abstract concept of "community," as they represent other community organizations. We use this definition when responding to the evaluation framework.

According to key informants:

- CBOs have a small role in the current training environment, and it is hard for them to secure project funding. The program requirements for credited training keep them on the outside of JS/FS, as does their scarcity in some regions (n=5).

- CBOs are typically more involved with underrepresented groups (Social Assistance, First Nations and Métis persons, immigrants, the disabled) who often have little previous work experience, minimal education, and other barriers to entering the workforce. Most CBOs offer Bridging and Life Skills courses that can link to JS/FS training, but do not offer the specific training for which employers are willing to pay. Therefore, CBOs are not usually part of JS/FS (n=5).

- However, CBOs do play a role in local/regional needs assessments in some areas. These planning processes have some implications for JS/FS training, but are much broader in scope.

In a more general vein, key informants told us that JS/FS has fostered partnerships, and created stronger links between SIAST/Regional Colleges and CSCES offices (n=6). However, some key informants noted that partnerships could be strengthened.

3.2 Use of the program

3.2.1 Profile of trainees

JS/FS trainees represent a range of age groups. Approximately one-third are "youth" (under the age of 25), while a further 30% are between the ages of 25 and 34. One-quarter (23%) of trainees are between the ages of 35 and 44, with 14% aged 45 and over.

Trainees in the Re-Training (RT) program were slightly older than those in Quick Skills (QS) and Work-Based Training (WBT), with a higher proportion of trainees over the age of 45, and fewer youth. This is because of the nature of the Re-Training program that provides training for those already employed.

Age	WBT	RT	QS	All
18 to 24	34%	29%	36%	34%
25 to 34	31%	30%	28%	29%
35 to 44	23%	24%	23%	23%
45 and over	12%	18%	14%	14%

Note: Age is recorded at time of training. DK/NR are not included in the table.
Source: Survey of trainees.

On average, 59% of trainees are male while 41% are female. This finding is consistent across programs. This bias to male trainees reflects the composition of Saskatchewan industry and those sectors experiencing vacancies (e.g., forestry, construction, manufacturing, processing). It also reflects the industry and occupations that can benefit from work-based

training, although this is changing with the introduction of other sectors such as health, manufacturing and information technology.

Table 10: Gender (n=1,005)				
Gender	WBT	RT	QS	All
Male	57%	58%	61%	59%
Female	43%	42%	39%	41%
Source: Survey of trainees.				

The majority of JS/FS trainees (69%) have a high school diploma or less, prior to participating in the program. Approximately 41% graduated from high school, 24% completed some high school, while 4% have less than a Grade 8 education. Educational levels are similar across programs, with Quick Skills being the lowest. Given the low education levels, many will not be eligible for trades courses or post-secondary education.

Level of education	WBT	RT	QS	All
Grade 8 or less	3%	3%	5%	4%
Some high school	22%	25%	27%	24%
Graduated high school	39%	40%	42%	41%
Some SIAST/Regional College	8%	9%	7%	7%
Some university	9%	3%	7%	7%
Graduated SIAST/Regional College	11%	8%	6%	9%
Graduated university	7%	9%	6%	7%
Other college / CBO	1%	2%	1%	1%
Source: Survey of trainees.				

Underrepresented groups are represented in programs, particularly the Quick Skills program. Approximately 29% of trainees consider themselves a member of a visible minority, 19% said they were a First Nation or Métis person, while 4% said they had a disability.

Of the three programs, Quick Skills had the highest representation among the underrepresented groups in all categories. Almost one-quarter of Quick Skills trainees are First Nations or Métis, and more than one-third report being a member of a visible minority group. Note that people self-report whether or not they are a member of a visible minority. Further, those who are First Nations or Métis also report being a visible minority, and are included in the totals.

Table 12: Other characteristics: Do you consider yourself to be...? (n=1,008)				
	WBT	RT	QS	All
Member of a visible minority	27%	21%	35%	29%
A First Nations or Métis person	16%	12%	24%	19%
A person with a disability	3%	2%	6%	4%
Source: Survey of trainees.				

Family composition differs notably across programs. More than half of the trainees in Quick Skills programs are either single and without children (34%) or single parents (19%). By contrast, two-thirds of Re-Training trainees are couples with children (51%), or couples without children (15%). Work-Based Training trainees fall in the middle, with half being single and the other half being couples.

[illegible]				
	WBT	RT	QS	All
Single – no children	32%	26%	34%	33%
Single – with children	15%	8%	19%	15%
Couple (married, common-law) – no children	12%	15%	10%	11%
Couple (married, common-law) – w/ children	41%	51%	36%	41%
Source: Survey of trainees.				

Household incomes reflect important differences among trainees in the different program streams. Quick Skills trainees are much more likely to have lower incomes than the other groups, as 43% earn less than $20,000 per year. By comparison, 21% of Re-Training trainees and 29% of Work-Based Training trainees earn less than $20,000.

[illegible]				
	WBT	RT	QS	All
Under $10,000	9%	7%	21%	14%
$10,000 - $20,000	20%	14%	22%	19%
$20,000 - $30,000	20%	17%	18%	19%
$30,000 - $40,000	18%	24%	12%	17%
$40,000 - $50,000	12%	13%	8%	11%
Above $50,000	15%	15%	10%	13%
Don't know / No response	6%	9%	9%	8%
Source: Survey of trainees.				

The survey of trainees included those from across all training regions in the province. Largest representation was from the Southeast Regional College area (16%), Saskatoon (13%), Parklands Regional College (10%), and Regina (10%). There appears to be relatively little program variation by region. That said, the regional classification is based on mailing address, not on where an individual participated in training.

[illegible]	WBT	RT	QS	All
Wascana SIAST	13%	11%	8%	10%
Kelsey SIAST	15%	14%	11%	13%
Woodland SIAST	4%	6%	8%	6%
Palliser SIAST	7%	2%	8%	7%
Southeast Regional College	10%	11%	9%	9%
Parkland Regional College	11%	13%	10%	10%
North West Regional College	6%	8%	6%	6%
Cumberland Regional College	8%	7%	6%	7%
Carlton Trail Regional College	8%	8%	10%	9%
Prairie West Regional College	5%	8%	5%	5%
Northlands College	5%	4%	10%	7%
Cypress Hills Regional College	7%	9%	7%	7%
Lakeland College	1%	-	3%	2%

Source: Database – Survey of trainees. Regions are based on Regional College and SIAST districts. 40 respondents had missing addresses.

Social Assistance participation is highest in the Quick Skills program, with 37% reporting being on SA prior to training. In the other programs, 23% of Work-Based Training trainees were on SA at some point prior to training, while 13% of Re-Training trainees were on SA at some time. EI participation is similar across programs, with approximately 40% having collected at some time prior to training. Note, that stints on SA and EI may have preceded training by some years.

[illegible]	Work-Based Training	Re-Training	Quick Skills	Total
Social Assistance	23%	13%	37%	27%
Employment Insurance	40%	39%	39%	40%

Note: Respondents could provide more than one response. Totals sum to more than 100%.

The survey of trainees included those who have participated in the JS/FS Program from 1 to 5 years ago. Re-Training trainees typically began training 2 to 3 years ago. There were greater numbers of recent Quick Skills graduates (22% began training within the last year) compared to the other programs.

Years since training began	WBT	RT	QS	All
1 year	9%	4%	22%	14%
2	21%	43%	30%	28%
3	30%	40%	16%	25%
4	18%	13%	6%	12%
5 +	23%	-	26%	21%

Source: Survey of trainees, JS/FS database.

3.2.2 Profile of employers

Most employers participating in WBT hired only one trainee since 1995, while 34% hired between 2 and 10 trainees. Only 7% report hiring more than 10 trainees. Employers in the Re-Training program typically trained more people; 43% report re-training one employee, while the same proportion trained between 2 and 10 trainees.

Employers participating in the Work-Based Training program report hiring an average of four trainees since 1995. Those participating in Work-Based Re-Training had an average of six workers receiving a Re-Training subsidy.

	WBT (n=111)	RT (n=105)
One trainee	56%	43%
2 to 10 trainees	34%	43%
More than 10 trainees	7%	12%
None/Don't know/No response	3%	2%

Note: Respondents may have used both programs. Totals may sum to more than 100%.
Source: Survey of employers.

Larger companies typically participate in the Re-Training program. Nearly one-fifth (18%) of employers involved in the Re-Training program have more than 50 full-time staff, while 11% have between 25 and 50 employees. By comparison, almost half of the companies that participated in WBT have fewer than five full-time employees. This data suggests that smaller companies are more likely to use JS/FS to adjust to their initial growing pains.

Response	Full-time (≥ 30 hrs per week)			Part-time (< 30 hrs per week)		
	WBT	RT	Total	WBT	RT	Total
Under 5	48%	38%	44%	79%	76%	77%
6 to 10	12%	10%	12%	3%	7%	5%
11 to 25	21%	19%	20%	3%	7%	4%
26 to 50	7%	11%	8%	4%	6%	5%
More than 50	11%	18%	13%	2%	2%	2%
No response	2%	4%	3%	4%	3%	7%

Note: Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
Source: Survey of employers.

Employers in the WBT program spend more money on training employees than those in a Re-Training program. Approximately one-fifth (21%) of WBT employers spent more than $10,000 per employee on training,

compared to 7% of Re-Training employers. About 44% of Re-Training employers spent less than $2,500, suggesting that the overall cost of re-training is less than that of training a new employee, who will typically require considerable skill development on the job.

Table 15: On average, approximately how much did your company spend (direct and in-kind costs) on training per employee while participating in the program? (n=150)

Response	WBT	RT	Total
$0 to $2,500	25%	44%	36%
$2,500 to $5,000	25%	26%	26%
$5,000 to $7,500	14%	11%	12%
$7,500 to $10,000	8%	7%	6%
More than $10,000	21%	7%	13%
Don't know/No response	6%	7%	6%

Note: Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
Source: Survey of employers.

3.2.3 Summary

A variety of individuals participate in JS/FS due to the range of programs offered. The JS/FS Program appeals to people of all ages, including those just entering the workforce, as well as others who are older and adjusting to industry changes. Most have little formal education beyond high school (69%), and take Quick Skills courses or Work-Based Training to facilitate immediate entry or re-entry into the workforce. About one-third (31%) has taken some form of post-secondary education, and is seeking work experience to enter the labour force.

Under-represented groups participate in Quick Skills courses at higher rates – particularly First Nations and Métis peoples, and Social Assistance recipients.

The subsidy levels are appropriate, and while many employers would like to see the reintroduction of re-training subsidies, staff and managers argue that other priorities should have precedence.

4.0 Success/Impacts/Effects

Most trainees complete the program and find work, reporting increased wages and decreased reliance on EI and SA. Employers support the program strongly, and staff are advocates.

Several approaches exist to measure JS/FS Program success:

- *Successful transition to work or retention upon program completion.* Trainees in Work-Based Training are successful if they remain employed following the end of the subsidy. Those in Quick Skills courses are successful if they find work upon completing their classroom training.
- *Transition to further training.* For some, JS/FS is a stepping-stone toward further education and training. Training is successful if it contributes to further advancement along one's chosen career path.
- *Increased self-sufficiency.* Increased self-sufficiency can be measured by comparing wages prior to training, during training, and after program completion.
- *Decreased reliance on EI or Social Assistance.* Decreased reliance on income assistance reflects success on the part of the trainee, and savings to the government account.
- *Successful program completion and certification.* Program completion and certification indicates whether clients were properly placed and supported while in training.

This section also examines how career counseling, CSCES support services, and labour market information (LMI) contributed to meeting trainee and employer needs in relation to the five measures above.

4.1 Linkages to work

4.1.1 Different components of JobStart/Future Skills meet different industry needs

Manufacturing and processing occupations are a larger part of Work-Based Training and Re-Training. Nearly one-third (32%) of Work-Based Trainees train for these industries, and over one-quarter (26%) of Re-Training trainees were in manufacturing or processing jobs.

Quick Skills trainees often found jobs in trucking (13%) and health care (17%). Others found work in agriculture, construction, and tourism/hospitality. However, while only 3% trained for retail or tourism/hospitality sectors, 16% are employed in these jobs, which may not have been the graduate's first choice.

In addition to manufacturing and processing, health care, construction, and government/tribal council sectors used the Re-Training program.

Table 21: What type of company did you work for while in Work-Based Training / Re-Training, or following your Quick Skills training?

Type of company	WBT (n=447)	RT (n=149)	QS (n=364)
Manufacturing	18%	14%	8%
Processing	14%	12%	4%
Information Technology (includes film and video)	12%	7%	4%
Agriculture	11%	7%	11%
Construction	11%	11%	12%
Retail	11%	7%	6%
Tourism and Hospitality	7%	5%	10%
Health (home care, health aide)	5%	14%	17%
Resources (mining, forestry)	4%	2%	3%
Trucking	3%	3%	13%
Financial	3%	9%	-
Education	1%	1%	-
Government / Tribal Council	1%	10%	4%
Other (specify)	1%	1%	2%

Source: Survey of trainees.

The majority of these jobs (between 73% and 80%) were full-time positions, while up to one-fifth of trainees were working part-time. Overall, trainees worked 41 hours per week on average.

Table 22: Hours per week—While in Work-Based Training / Re-Training, or after Quick Skills Training

Hours per week	WBT (n=447)	RT (n=149)	QS (n=364)
Part-time (<35 hours per week)	15%	21%	21%
Full-time	80%	76%	73%
Don't know / No response	4%	3%	6%
Average hours per week	40 hrs	41 hrs	41 hrs

Note: Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
Source: Survey of trainees.

4.1.2 Quick Skills courses offer a high expectation of work upon completion

The JobStart/Future Skills Program links Quick Skills training to employment. In its design, the program does not provide "training for training's sake," but rather provides training that leads to continuing employment. Several program features accomplish this, including offering courses in areas where there is strong demand by trainees. As part of this process, SIAST and Regional Colleges staff often contact employers directly in an attempt to secure work for trainees. In other cases, trainees are encouraged to develop their own contacts so that they will find work upon graduation.

Findings from the trainee survey suggest that this process works. We asked Quick Skills trainees whether they expected to work after completing their training, and more than half (54%) said that they expected to work immediately after completing their program.

Most (82%) of those who received Quick Skills training reported they found work after their training. In fact, the majority (72%) found work within three months of completing their Quick Skills program. However,

- Nearly one in five did not find work within six months of program completion, or did not find work at all.
- Persons with a disability were less likely to find work following program completion (25% did not find work, compared to 14% for those without a reported disability).
- Among First Nations and Métis trainees, 21% reported that they did not find work following their Quick Skills training (compared to 13% for non-First Nations or non-Métis persons).
- Those on Social Assistance prior to participating in Quick Skills were less likely to find work (24% did not find work, compared to 9% of those who were not on SA prior to training).
- Other groups (visible minorities and those on EI prior to training) had similar rates of employment after training.

[illegible] after your program ended did you find work? – Quick Skills (n=142)

Time to find work	All	First Nations / Métis	Disability	On SA prior to JS/FS
0 to 3 months	72%	60%	61%	58%
4 to 6 months	6%	8%	7%	7%
7 months to 1 year	2%	4%	-	4%
More than 1 year	2%	4%	4%	4%
Did not find work	15%	21%	25%	24%
Don't know / No response	3%	4%	4%	3%

Note: Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
Source: Survey of trainees.

Quick Skills graduates who found work stayed at that job for an average of 14 months.

Table 24: How many months were you employed there? – Employment after Quick Skills training	
Length of Employment	%
2 years or more	22%
12 to 23 months	16%
6 to 11 months	26%
Less than six months	32%
Don't know / No response	4%
Average duration of employment	14 months
Note: Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding. Source: Survey of trainees.	

Overall, 60% of trainees said their Quick Skills training helped them *a lot* in finding their job. One in five (19%) said their training did not help at all.

Table 25: To what extent did your course or training help you get the job? – Employment after Quick Skills training	
Rating	%
A lot	60%
A little	11%
Not very much	7%
Not at all	19%
Don't know / No response	3%
Note: Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding. Source: Survey of trainees.	

4.1.3 Work-Based Training is meant to provide employment beyond the duration of the training subsidy

Work-Based Training helps individuals find long-term employment. The program encourages employers to select individuals who will benefit from training and remain employed at the end of the subsidy. Failure to retain an employee results in a loss of the employer's investment in the trainees, as employers will typically cover 50% or more of the training costs.

Results from the trainee survey suggest that the Work-Based Training program has met this goal. More than three-quarters (79%) of those who completed Work-Based Training remained with their employer for at least six months after the program ended (see Table 26). Twenty-two percent (22%) worked with their employer for six months to one year, 26% worked for between one and two years, while one-third have remained with their Work-Based Training employer for more than two years.

Table 26: Approximately how many months did you work at that company after the training program ended? – Work-Based Training

Months employed	WBT (n=289)
More than 2 years	31%
1 to 2 years	26%
6 months to a year	22%
4 to 6 months	8%
0 to 3 months	12%
Don't know / No response	2%

Note: Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
Source: Survey of trainees.

4.1.4 Some use their training to find better employment

Credited training produces benefits that include increased mobility of trainees. While employers typically hope to retain those whom they have trained, some trainees will inevitably look for better/higher paying employment if they believe they are capable of finding it.

Over one-quarter (28%) said that they had been employed with someone other than their Work-Based Training / Re-Training employer, or at a job other than the one they worked at immediately following Quick Skills training.

The main reasons people looked for an alternative employer were:

- Higher wages, more hours, or better benefits (35%).
- They were laid off (30%).
- Wanted a better employer (17%) or better working conditions (11%).

Employers agreed, reporting that trainees are most likely to leave voluntarily after the program, either because they were hired by a competitor (14%), they quit (5%), or they decided seek employment outside the industry (21%) or return to school (9%).

Table 27: [illegible] trainee leave after the program has ended? (n=[illegible])	
Reason	**%**
None have left	36%
Seek other type of employment outside the industry	21%
Hired by a competitor	14%
Attended school for further training	9%
Employee left job	5%
Employee moved	5%
Employee not suitable	3%
Job term/contract ended	3%
Lack of funds	1%
Other reasons	7%
No response	9%

Note: Respondents could choose more than one answer. Totals may sum to more than 100%.
Source: Survey of employers.

One-quarter of Quick Skills and Work-Based Training trainees have had more than one employer since completing their training, compared to 15% of Re-Training trainees.[8] This finding shows that JS/FS training contributes to job mobility through the transferability of skills.

Table 28: Number of employers (n=1008)				
# of employers	**WBT (n=444)**	**RT (n=149)**	**QS (n=442)**	**All (n=1,008)**
Multiple employers	27%	15%	28%	26%
One employer	63%	85%	54%	63%
No employers	10%	-	18%	12%

Note: Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
Source: Survey of trainees.

Table 29: Number of additional jobs since completing training (n=259)				
# of jobs	**WBT (n=117)**	**RT (n=22)**	**QS (n=122)**	**All (n=259)**
1 job	43%	59%	34%	40%
2	28%	27%	35%	32%
3	12%	5%	16%	13%
4 or more	17%	9%	15%	15%

Note: Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
Source: Survey of trainees. Includes those who worked had multiple jobs since completing training.

[8] Trainees were asked whether they had worked at another job; other than the one for which they received their work-based training or, for those in Quick Skills training, whether they had worked at more than one job following completion of their course. In some cases, persons may have had more than one job at the same time, although most would have left one job to take another. This question provides an indication of job "mobility".

The type of work done at additional jobs is similar to that of initial jobs. Construction was the most common occupation at 12%, followed by health (10%), transportation/trucking (9%), tourism/hospitality (9%), and agriculture (9%; see table below).

	WBT	RT	QS	All
Construction	8%	9%	17%	12%
Health (home care, health aide)	5%	18%	12%	10%
Transportation / Truck driving	4%	5%	16%	9%
Agriculture	10%	5%	9%	9%
Tourism and Hospitality	11%	5%	7%	9%
Manufacturing	11%	9%	6%	9%
Information Technology (includes film and video)	13%	9%	5%	9%
Retail	8%	9%	7%	8%
Resources (mining, forestry)	8%	14%	5%	6%
Processing	5%	9%	3%	4%
Government / Tribal council	4%	-	4%	4%
Financial	4%	-	2%	3%
General labourer	3%	-	3%	3%
Other	5%	8%	4%	5%

Note: Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
Source: Survey of trainees. Includes those who worked at more than one job following training.

Approximately one in four respondents had worked at the other job for less than six months. One-fifth (21%) worked between six months and one year, while 22% worked between one and two years. Almost one-third (31%) said they had worked at their job for more than two years. Respondents worked an average of 17 months at these additional jobs.

	WBT	RT	QS	All
Two years or more	34%	41%	27%	31%
12 to 23 months	27%	14%	18%	22%
6 to 11 months	13%	23%	28%	21%
Less than six months	20%	23%	25%	23%
Don't know / No response	6%	-	2%	3%
Average duration of employment	18 months	17 months	15 months	17 months

Source: Survey of trainees. Includes those who worked at more than one job following training.

More than three-quarters (78%) of additional jobs were full-time. Former trainees of Work-Based Re-Training were more likely to go on to part-time work if they found other work following their training. This likely indicates that Re-Training trainees represent a different "type" of trainee, and that their motivation to find other work is not driven by income or job advancement. On average, respondents worked 42 hours per week at these jobs.

	WBT	RT	QS	All
Part-time (<35 hours per week)	13%	41%	17%	17%
Full-time	82%	55%	78%	78%
Don't know / No response	5%	5%	5%	5%
Average hours per week	44 hrs	34 hrs	42 hrs	42 hrs

Source: Survey of trainees. Includes those who worked at more than one job following training.

Only 35% said their training helped *a lot* in getting this second job / next job, compared to 60% who found the training very helpful in securing their first job. This might indicate that experience is more important than training. It could also indicate that those seeking additional jobs did so in fields other than the one in which they trained.

	WBT	RT	QS	All
A lot	25%	32%	45%	35%
A little	22%	9%	19%	20%
Not very much	14%	9%	12%	13%
Not at all	39%	50%	24%	33%

Source: Survey of trainees. Includes those who worked at more than one job following training.

4.2 Transitions to training

The types of training provided under the different components of the JS/FS Program are unique. Although Work-Based Training typically involves some training from a supervisor at the work-site, combinations of on-site and classroom-based learning can occur.

- Most (88%) who received Work-Based Training were trained by another employee at the company. In many cases, training on-the-job was supplemented with classroom training (19%) or correspondence courses (10%).

- Re-Training students were more likely to be involved in classroom training (28%), training from a private organization (13%), or correspondence learning (11%), although the majority (69%) reported at least some training being done at work, by another employee of the company.

Type of training	WBT (n=447)	RT (n=149)
On the job training by a supervisor or other employee	88%	69%
Correspondence learning	10%	11%
Training by a community organization or other private trainer	4%	13%
Classroom training at SIAST or a Regional College	19%	28%
Other (specify)	2%	9%

Note: Respondents could provide more than one response. Totals do not sum to 100%.
Source: Survey of trainees.

SIAST or Regional Colleges provide Quick Skills courses. The most common courses were in trucking, health, trades, and office or computer skills.

Type of course	%
Truck driving	19%
Special care aide (health)	11%
Welding / Machining / Steam fitting	11%
Office / Computers	10%
Life skills	8%
Other (specify)	7%
Medical / Emergency (health)	6%
Don't know / No response	6%
Agriculture	4%
Carpentry	4%
Heavy equipment	4%
Childcare	3%
Retail / Tourism	3%
Telemarketing	3%

Note: Respondents could provide more than one response. Totals do not sum to 100%.
Source: Survey of trainees.

Overall, nearly one-third (31%) of respondents built on their training, taking additional courses at work or school.

- Nearly half (49%) reported that their training built on their JS/FS training.
- Over half (56%) said that their most recent training helped them find further employment or improved their position in the company.

Type of education / training	%
No additional training	69%
Course at SIAST or Regional College	9%
Further on-the-job training	8%
Course with private trainer or CBO	6%
University	4%
Self-study	2%
Other college / university / technical school	2%
CPR / First aid / Safety course	2%
High school / GED	1%
Other (specify)	<1%
Don't know / No response	1%

Source: Survey of trainees.

4.3 Economic self-sufficiency

For the purpose of this evaluation, there are three ways to measure economic self-sufficiency:

- Increased earnings following program completion.
- Reduced reliance on Social Assistance.
- Reduced reliance on Employment Insurance.

The importance of these indicators depends in part on the type of trainee and the program in which they were enrolled. Those who have had a long history on Social Assistance may not become independent immediately. Many who are on Social Assistance lack a high school education, have a disability, or are dealing with substance abuse. Although some collect Social Assistance only temporarily, others may cycle between low wage employment and Social Assistance. For these individuals, reduced reliance on Social Assistance is likely the best indicator of program success.

Other trainees will have had little or no history on Social Assistance, but are looking for an opportunity to change or develop a career path. Some are recent graduates with limited skills or work experience, and are looking to make an immediate transition to the workforce. Increased earnings indicate economic self-sufficiency for these individuals over time.

Trainees in Re-Training programs are typically upgrading their skills at the suggestion of their employer. As such, expectations of increased earnings are typically modest, as this is a less important objective of the program. That said, skill development should provide the potential for higher earnings and/or labour market mobility.

4.3.1 Increased earnings following program completion

The survey of trainees tracked earnings during three phases:

- Prior to program participation.
- While in training and at the program's end (Work-Based Trainees)/immediately following training (Quick Skills).
- Earnings at the longest-held job were also tracked for those who worked at more than one job after program completion.

Most respondents (83%) were employed prior to their training program, and earned an average of $9.46 per hour. Of the three program groups,

those in Quick Skills earned the least at their pre-training job ($9.00 per hour), with approximately one-third earning less than $7.50 per hour.

Trainees in the Re-Training program report the highest average hourly earnings while in the program ($11.01 per hour), which is not surprising, since they are most established in their positions. Quick Skills graduates report earning an average of $9.67 per hour, while those training on-the-job earn $9.34 per hour. Wages per week follow a similar trend, with 30% of those in Re-Training reporting earnings of more than $500 per week, compared to 16% of those in Work-Based Training and 18% of those in Quick Skills (note: based on first job upon completing training).

[illegible] / during (WBT / RT) or post program (Quick Skills)

Hourly wage	WBT (n=383)		RT (n=141)		QS (n=337)		Total (n=839)	
	Pre	During	Pre	During	Pre	Post	Pre	During/Post
Under $6.50	15%	12%	8%	8%	18%	11%	15%	11%
$6.50 to $7.49	15%	18%	14%	9%	13%	11%	14%	14%
$7.50 to $8.49	15%	15%	9%	11%	16%	12%	14%	13%
$8.50 to $9.99	8%	13%	6%	8%	8%	11%	8%	12%
$10.00 to $12.49	18%	18%	26%	22%	15%	24%	18%	21%
$12.50 to $15.00	8%	6%	13%	13%	8%	11%	9%	9%
Over $15.00	7%	7%	10%	12%	4%	2%	6%	6%
DK / NR	14%	13%	15%	17%	17%	18%	16%	16%
Average hourly wage	$9.42	$9.34	$10.70	$11.01	$9.00	$9.67	$9.46	-
Average salary / week	-	$380	-	$463	-	$436	-	-

Source: Survey of trainees.

Over half of Work-Based Training trainees (52%) report receiving a raise following completion of training. Approximately one-third of trainees report no difference, while 11% could not recall. Proportions are lower for those in Re-Training, where 61% report no change in wages. This difference reflects the different intentions of these two programs. Work-Based Training enables employers to hire new employees, and a raise following program completion is a reward, which may reflect completion of a "trial" period. Those in Re-Training may be asked to participate in re-training to upgrade their skills, but apparently, this does not immediately lead to higher wages.

[illegible] hourly rate paid after your Work-Based Training / Re-Training [illegible] how much more did you earn per hour?

Change in hourly wage	WBT (n=289)	RT (n=149)
No difference	35%	61%
Under $1.00	9%	11%
$1.00 to $1.99	16%	9%
$2.00 to $2.99	15%	7%
More than $3.00	13%	4%
Don't know / No response	11%	10%

Note: Asked only of Work-Based Training and Re-Training trainees who were re-hired after their subsidy period.
Source: Survey of trainees.

In some cases, trainees left work and found other work aside from their work-based training / re-training position, or the job that was acquired immediately following Quick Skills training. Those in Work-Based Training or Quick Skills apparently find that jobs pay more than what they were currently receiving. Former Work-Based training trainees appear to find jobs that pay more, with an increase of approximately $1.80 per hour or $120 per week on average. Those in Quick Skills report slight increases of $1 per hour. The few Re-Training trainees that found other work earned less per hour and per week.

Wage	WBT (n=119)	RT (n=22)	QS (n=124)	Total (n=259)
Under $6.50	6%	14%	11%	9%
$6.50 to $7.49	10%	5%	13%	11%
$7.50 to $8.49	10%	9%	9%	10%
$8.50 to $9.99	8%	5%	6%	7%
$10.00 to $12.49	24%	32%	23%	24%
$12.50 to $15.00	12%	14%	19%	15%
Over $15.00	13%	9%	8%	11%
Don't know / No response	16%	14%	12%	14%
Average hourly wage	$11.12	$10.82	$10.67	$10.91
Average weekly salary	$503	$402	$446	$466

Source: Survey of trainees.

4.3.2 Reliance on Social Assistance / Employment Insurance

Survey trainees were asked whether they had been on Social Assistance or Employment Insurance prior to training or after training. Overall, fewer trainees report reliance on Social Assistance after training (17%, compared to 27% before) or EI support after training (23%, compared to 40% before).

Similarly, when comparing the 12 months prior to training and the 12 months after training, the average duration of Social Assistance or EI support is lower after training, which may indicate that graduates' skills and/or experience help them find a job more quickly than before. It may also reflect the fact that some trainees are still in training, or have recently completed their training. Note that variations exist between programs, and that sample sizes can be very small.

	Work-Based Training				Re-Training				Quick Skills				Total			
	Before		After		Before		After		Before		After		Before		After	
	mth	n	mth	n	mth	n	mth	n	mth	n	mth	n	mth	n	mth	n
SA	6.9	51	5.7	30	5.4	7	6.0	3	7.9	109	6.3	98	7.5	159	6.3	124
EI	4.2	81	4.3	77	4.1	21	4.8	28	4.7	92	3.3	67	4.4	187	4.0	166

Note: The figure above indicates average the number of months on SA/EI during the 12-month periods before and after training. Respondents may have participated in more than one program.

As mentioned above, the Quick Skills program has the highest rate of Social Assistance participation, with 37% reporting being on SA prior to training. In the other programs, 23% of Work-Based Training trainees and 13% of Re-Training trainees were on SA at some point prior to training. Following training, 8% fewer Quick Skills trainees report being on SA, 13% fewer Work-Based Training trainees, and 6% fewer Re-Training trainees. For the overall sample, this represents a 10% drop.

Reliance on EI also declines as a result of training. EI participation is similar across programs, with approximately 40% having collected at some time prior to training. In all cases, EI participation drops by at least 14%, with the largest decline among Quick Skills trainees.

	Work-Based Training		Re-Training		Quick Skills		Total	
	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After
SA	23%	10%	13%	7%	37%	29%	27%	17%
EI	40%	26%	39%	23%	39%	21%	40%	23%

Note: Respondents could provide more than one response. Totals sum to more than 100%.

- Nearly three-quarters (73%) of those who went on Social Assistance after program completion were on Social Assistance at some point prior to the program.

	First Nations / Métis		Disabled		EI pre training		All respondents	
	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After
SA	54%	43%	46%	28%	32%	16%	27%	17%
EI	35%	22%	54%	26%	100%	31%	40%	23%

Note: Respondents could provide more than one response. Totals sum to more than 100%.

- Persons with a disability were more likely to go on Social Assistance following their JS/FS training (28% compared to 17%).
- This is also true for First Nations and Métis persons: 43% of First Nations and Métis trainees went on SA after their training, compared to 11% of non-First nations and non-Métis trainees.
- Nearly one-third (31%) of trainees who were on EI prior to the program returned to EI at some point following program completion. Some (18%) of those who were not on EI prior to the program collected EI following program completion.

4.4 Key findings - First Nations and Métis persons

Overall, First Nations and Métis persons have less successful outcomes when compared to the rest of the sample. In general, they start with much lower educational levels, are more likely to have been on Social Assistance prior to the program, and are more likely to return to Social Assistance following program completion.

- Persons of First Nations or Métis ancestry were more likely to discontinue their Work-Based Training program. Some 21% of First Nations or Métis trainees report discontinuing compared to 9% of the remaining sample.
- Just under half (45%) of First Nations and Métis trainees did not remain at their job following completion of the Work-Based Training, compared to 20% of other trainees.
- Among those who remained employed, First Nations and Métis trainees were less likely to be given a raise upon completion of their work-based training (48% received a raise), compared to 69% of other trainees.
- First Nations and Métis trainees were as likely to complete their Quick Skills Training as non-First Nations / non-Métis trainees.
- First Nations and Métis trainees were less likely to find work following completion of their Quick Skills training (21% did not find work, compared to 13% of non-First Nations / non-Métis trainees).
- Sample sizes for Re-Training trainees were too small to be conclusive about differences between First Nations and Métis trainees and non-First Nations / non-Métis trainees.
- Thirteen percent (13%) of First Nations and Métis trainees had less than a Grade 8 education (compared to 2% of non-First Nations and non-Métis trainees), while 42% had some high school education (compared to 20% of the remaining sample).
- Just under one-third (30%) of First Nations and Métis trainees are single parents, compared to 12% of non-First Nations and non-Métis trainees.
- Fifty-eight percent (58%) of First Nations and Métis trainees report less than $20,000 in annual income, compared to 27% of non-First Nations and non-Métis trainees.

- Over half (55%) of First Nations and Métis trainees were on Social Assistance at some point prior to beginning their JS/FS training, compared with 21% of the remaining sample. A similar proportion of First Nations and Métis trainees (43%) return to Social Assistance at some point following program completion (compared to 11% for other trainees).

4.5 Key findings - former Social Assistance recipients

Former Social Assistance recipients also have less successful outcomes than non-Social Assistance recipients. Some overlap exists with the above findings, as many former Social Assistance recipients are First Nations or Métis. While the JS/FS Program helps many former SA recipients to find work and remain off "welfare," approximately half of those previously on Social Assistance will return to Social Assistance at some point following program completion.

- Social Assistance recipients were as likely as non-Social Assistance recipients to complete their Work-Based and Quick Skills training.
- Thirty-eight percent (38%) of former Social Assistance recipients did not remain employed following completion of their Work-Based Training programs, compared to 19% of non-Social Assistance recipients.
- Approximately one-quarter (24%) of former Social Assistance recipients did not find work following completion of their Quick Skills Training, compared to 9% of non-Social Assistance recipients.
- Forty-four percent (44%) of former Social Assistance recipients have less than a high school diploma, compared to 21% of non-Social Assistance recipients.
- A higher proportion of former Social Assistance recipients are single parents (30%, compared to 10% of non-SA recipients).
- Over half (55%) of former Social Assistance recipients earned less than $20,000 at the time of the survey, twice the proportion of non-Social Assistance recipients (25%).
- Just under half (47%) of those who were on Social Assistance prior to the program returned to Social Assistance at some point following program completion.

The lower success rates of those on Social Assistance reflect the greater education and experience deficits of this group relative to other trainees. Many Social Assistance clients need pre-training preparation to equip them to be successful in the JS/FS Program.

4.6 Certification

The JS/FS program's structure includes the provision of certification or accreditation. Most staff (91%) said providing credited training is an "important part" of JobStart/Future Skills. Seventy-eight percent (78%) noted the importance of establishing credit for previous learning or experience, in the design of JS/FS.

Overall, most trainees worked toward some type of certification. Most (79%) Quick Skills trainees said their course led to certification. The same can be said of Work-Based Training, as 40% received SIAST / Regional College credit, while 21% received industry credit. Similarly for Re-Training, 50% received SIAST / Regional College credit, while 15% received industry credit.

[illegible]: What certification or credit for training did you get? (What degree or certificate) – While in Work-Based Training / Re-Training

Type of certification	WBT (n=378)	RT (n=149)
SIAST/Regional College certification – course credit	40%	50%
Industry credit	21%	15%
A letter stating that you had attained specific skills	13%	12%
No certification offered	24%	15%
Other	2%	1%
Don't know / No response	5%	6%

Note: Respondents could provide more than one response. Totals do not sum to 100%.
Source: Survey of trainees.

Most employers find the process of determining accreditation with industry and SIAST acceptable (57%), while 5% find the process to be unacceptable, and the remaining 39% are neutral. Note, however, that almost one-quarter of those in Work-Based Training reported receiving no certification. Since most training has certification attached, this figure seems too high.

Industry representatives have also become involved in developing Prior Learning Assessment and Recognition (PLAR), which sets standards and measures for translating previous learning on the job into "credit." This process is relatively new, although groups are working together to develop standards. A few key informants who are close to the process suggest that much work still needs to be done. That said, in the survey of field staff, 50% said that "recognizing previous learning and experience and

establishing credit for it is "very important," while a further 28% claimed that it is "somewhat important." This suggests that staff support this process.

4.7 Reasons for discontinuation

Relatively high completion rates reflect the practical nature of JS/FS training. Eighty-five percent (85%) of trainees completed their Work-Based Training, while 3% are currently enrolled. Eleven percent (11%) said that they did not complete training. Of those who did not complete the program, 30% left because they did not like the job or changed their career plan, 22% found another job, and 10% left because the company closed.

- First Nations and Métis trainees were slightly less likely to complete the training (77% compared to 86%).
- 95% of Re-Training trainees completed their program.

Most (89%) Quick Skills trainees report completing their program; 2% say they are currently enrolled, and 10% said that they did not complete their training. Reasons for non-completion include health problems (n=13), family issues (n=9), changing career plans (n=6), and finding a job (n=5). Persons with a disability were less likely to complete their classroom training than those without a disability (79%, compared to 89%).

Reason for non-completion	WBT (n=54)	QS (n=44)
Had another job	22%	11%
Changed career plans	16%	14%
Did not like the job	14%	-
Company closed	10%	-
Health problems	6%	30%
Pregnancy	6%	2%
Went to university	4%	-
Transportation problems	4%	-
Family issues	4%	21%
Went back to SIAST/Regional College	2%	-
Fired / quit / laid off	-	14%
Other (specify)	18%	20%

Note: Respondents could provide more than one response. Totals do not sum to 100%.
This question was not asked of Re-Training trainees, given the nature of the Re-Training program.
Source: Survey of trainees.

4.8 Effectiveness of action plans/career counseling

As part of the overall training strategy, trainees are encouraged to complete career planning, to ensure focussed training that leads to the desired outcome. SIAST/Regional Colleges staff, CSCES offices, or other training deliverers provide counseling. Nearly one-third (31%) said they developed a career plan before JS/FS training.

- Of the respondents who had a plan (n=313), 19% said their plan was complete, 61% said that they were still proceeding, 10% reported stopping before it ended, while 9% had yet to start. A large majority (87%) who had invested in a career plan found it to be "very helpful" or "somewhat helpful."

	%
Very helpful	45%
Somewhat helpful	42%
Not very helpful	5%
Not at all helpful	5%
Don't know / No response	3%

Source: Survey of trainees.

Forty-three percent (43%) have used the CSCES centres, the majority of whom (68%) felt that CSCES resources were effective in meeting their needs.

Respondents also reported receiving help from SIAST, Regional Colleges, or other school support services (9%). They also received 'informal' assistance from family or friends (7%), or by searching the newspaper for information (7%).

Resources	%
None / Can't think of any	71%
Support from SIAST/Regional College teacher or counsellor / school resource centre	9%
Family/friends	7%
Newspaper	7%
Employment offices	5%
HRDC	4%
Employers / unions / businesses	4%
Social Services / New Careers	3%
Internet / Computer kiosk	2%
Band / Tribal offices	2%
Other	2%

Note: Respondents could provide more than one response. Totals do not sum to 100%.
Source: Survey of trainees.

Most JS/FS trainees (85%) said they could not think of any other support services that would have been helpful either before or during training. Those who did need more support were most likely to want help from their families, or with personal issues.

Table 47: Were there any other support services that might have helped you better prior to training, or while in training? (n=1,508)	
	%
None	85%
Family support	4%
Personal/financial counselling	3%
Tutoring	3%
Career planning	3%
Employer support	3%
Better information about the job market	2%
Other	5%
Source: Survey of trainees.	

Twenty-six percent (26%) of staff agree that trainees receive enough support while in training, while 30% disagree. The remaining staff are neutral or not able to evaluate whether trainees receive enough training support. This lack of knowledge may explain why 51% said that monitoring of trainees' progress while they are in training could be improved.

Thinking about the Quick Skills program which provides short-term, credit training to [illegible] industry needs for qualified employees, please evaluate the following statements: (n=60)						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not sure/ NR
Quick Skills trainees receive sufficient training support while in training	3%	23%	18%	23%	7%	25%
Note: Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding. Source: Survey of staff.						

4.9 Satisfaction with Labour Market Information (LMI)

We asked employers about the sufficiency of LMI available to them. Less than half (41%) found adequate information. The remainder said it was inadequate (25%), or were unsure / chose not to respond (34%).

Table 49: Is there sufficient Labour Market Information (LMI) to assist your company with human resource planning? (n=[illegible])

	%
Yes, more than enough	5%
Yes, adequate	36%
No	25%
Don't know/No response	34%

Note: Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
Source: Survey of employers.

Of employers who did not find LMI to be adequate, many wanted wage and benefits information (33%), but they also specified that information must be specific to their sector (27%) or region (6%) to be most useful to them. Nearly one-third wanted better access to information, either through increased awareness of where or how to get it (22%), or by having it delivered via the Internet (8%).

Table 50: What type of information would be helpful? (n=49)

	n	%
Standard wages and benefits information	16	33%
Industry / sector specific information	13	27%
Increased awareness: how or where to find LMI	11	22%
Deliver information via Internet	4	8%
Regional information	3	6%
Others	20	41%

Note: Respondents could choose more than one answer. Totals may sum to more than 100%.
Source: Survey of employers.

4.10 Summary

Overall, the JS/FS Program is very successful, as most trainees find or retain work upon completing the program. Three-quarters of Quick Skills graduates find work within 3 months of graduating from their course, while 82% find work within the year. Over three-quarters (77%) of those who completed their Work-Based Training remained at their job following program completion.

Trainees also report increased self-sufficiency following training. Quick Skills trainees report finding higher-paid work upon completing training. Most Work-Based Training trainees (53%) receive an increase in pay upon

completion. Those who go on to other work following program completion report much higher wages and average salaries, suggesting that the program has increased mobility and earning potential of some trainees.

The JS/FS Program also helps reduce reliance on SA and EI. Quick Skills trainees are most dependent on SA, although there is a decrease from 37% to 29% following program completion. For the entire sample, SA dependence drops by 10%, while EI dependence drops by 17%.

Based on most of the key indicators, outcomes for First Nations and Métis trainees and former Social Assistance recipients are significantly lower. In both cases, completion rates are lower, fewer find or retain work upon completion, and more are likely to go on Social Assistance following program completion. Demographics suggest that both groups have much lower education levels, have less income, and are more likely to be single parents. As such, more pre-employment training and post-employment follow-up may be required.

5.0 Program design and delivery

This section reviews the processes of the JS/FS Program, including:

- Does JS/FS reflect the Saskatchewan Training Strategy?
- To what extent are programs and services integrated with other provincial programs and services?
- To what extent has JS/FS developed partnerships?
- How is the program being marketed?
- What type of income support is used by trainees?
- How extensive is local/regional decision-making?
- How flexible and responsive is the program?
- How effectively is the program managed?
- What relationship does SIAST/Regional Colleges have with PSEST/CSCES?

5.1 Does JS/FS reflect the Saskatchewan Training Strategy?

Respondents agreed that the JS/FS Program reflects the main principles of the Saskatchewan Training Strategy (STS). The three pillars of this strategy were:

- To develop a skilled workforce relevant to Saskatchewan's labour market
- To enhance access and support opportunities to all learners
- To create a coherent, effective, and sustainable delivery system.

Although the Saskatchewan Training Strategy (STS) has subsequently been replaced by the PSEST Sector Plan, the former strategy has had a stronger influence on the JS/FS Program's development. As such, the goals of the STS were taken to be the guiding principles of the JS/FS Program.

Developing a skilled workforce relevant to Saskatchewan's Labour Market

According to key informants, the JS/FS Program contributes to this goal by focusing on credited training and the development of a training culture within the workplace. Work-Based Training becomes relevant to the STS, since training is tailored to meet the needs of employers, and provides entry-level skills and credited training. Quick Skills courses exist in areas where demand for labour is high.

- Approximately 70% of staff report that this goal has been at least "partially met," while a further 13% claim that the goal has been "fully met."
- Staff suggested five improvements to further skill development in the province:

  a) *Better curriculum development by SIAST:* SIAST needs to develop materials that are up-to-date, and that more clearly meet industry needs. The curriculum needs to keep pace with changes in industry.

  b) *Increase access for employers:* Employers from all sectors should be encouraged to participate through better marketing and more flexible eligibility criteria. Key informants suggest increased development in rural areas and in the agricultural industry.

  c) *Simplify administrative processes*, which are disincentives for employers to participate in the program.

  d) *More support for trainees with multiple barriers.* This could include stronger linkages with support agencies (i.e., CBOs), and longer-term training that includes pre-employment preparation.

  e) *Re-introduce Re-Training:* A few staff said this program was necessary, and contributed to the development of a skilled workforce.

Enhancing access and support opportunities for all learners

Several key informants (n=6) said that the JS/FS Program enhances access to training because it is delivered to smaller communities (through Regional Colleges) or through the workplace. Others claim that not

enough trainees from underrepresented groups access the program, as the program is employer driven rather than trainee-driven.

- Three-quarters (75%) of staff report that the goal of enhancing access has been "partially met," while a further 13% claim that this goal has been "fully met."

- When asked how to improve the process, staff offer three main suggestions:

  a) *Provide a financial incentive to employers.* Given that the program is "employer-driven," employers may hire from underrepresented groups without changing the philosophy and rules of the program, though many will choose the candidate that they believe is most suitable for the position. Creating an incentive system (e.g., additional funding) was one suggestion for overcoming this perceived problem. This would also help offset the "risk" that some employers perceive when hiring someone with multiple employment barriers.

  b) *Improve program marketing to "inform" employers about the benefits of diversifying the workplace and hiring from underrepresented groups.* Some suggest this marketing should be done at the early proposal development phase, to encourage employers to consider hiring more individuals from underrepresented groups.

  c) *Training deliverers, CBOs, and CSCES should refer more people from underrepresented groups to employers.* Group co-ordination and increased linkages between these organizations and employers was said to improve the chances that employers would consider altering their hiring practices.

Creating a coherent, effective, and sustainable delivery system

Staff affirmed that strong linkages exist between Regional Colleges/SIAST and CSCES. Delivering the program both in the classroom and through the workplace contributes to program effectiveness and sustainability.

- Just over two-thirds (68%) of staff said that the goal of creating a coherent, effective, and sustainable delivery system has been partially met, while 8% said that this goal has been fully met. Regional Colleges/SIAST staff are more likely to say that the goal is not being met, suggesting that they believe the delivery system requires further improvement.

- Staff suggestions for creating a coherent, effective, and sustainable delivery system include:

  a) *Better communication and planning between delivery agencies, CSCES, and employers.* Employers should have more input into the planning process, and training should be provided in areas where there are job vacancies. The philosophy of SIAST/Regional Colleges staff and CSCES can differ, as the latter takes more of a "trainee" focus, when the program is predominantly employer-driven.

  b) *Clearer rules and responsibilities for programs.* Eligibility and rules for income support programs should be simplified.

  c) *Better integration between CSCES and SIAST/Regional Colleges.* Staff suggested co-location as a possibility.

  d) *More detailed follow-up and evaluation of the program.* Some believe that insufficient resources are spent on tracking outcomes, since staff does not have the time to do this adequately.

  e) *Make certification meet the needs of industry, rather than imposing academic credit where industry certification would suffice.* Some staff suggested making the program more practical, maintaining accreditation, but being flexible when it is more practical to meet specific job requirements rather than a course requirement.

  f) *More funding for delivering the program.* Time spent on administration, instructor assistance, supervision, and marketing the program does not receive adequate compensation.

	Goal fully met	Partially met	Goal not met	Not sure / NR
Developing a skilled workforce relevant to Saskatchewan's labour market	13%	70%	3%	13%
Enhancing access and support for learners	13%	75%	5%	7%
Creating a coherent, effective, and sustainable delivery system	8%	68%	13%	10%

Note: Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
Source: Staff survey.

5.1.1 To what extent are programs and services integrated with other programs and services?

The Work-Based Training component of the JS/FS Program is most closely linked with three other government employment programs: Work Placement, Community Works, and Bridging.

Work Placement /Community Works

Work Placement and Community Works are similar to WBT, in that each offers subsidies to employers. However, they differ in three ways. First, the Work-Based Training program emphasizes training tailored to the needs of employers, whereas Work Placement and Community Works do not mandate a training component as a condition for the subsidy. Second, the Work-Based Training program gives more freedom to employers to hire, whereas Work Placement and Community Works typically target underrepresented groups, particularly Social Assistance recipients. Finally, SIAST / Regional Colleges manage the JS/FS Program, whereas the other two employment programs are run through CSCES offices. CSCES counselors will typically take a more client-centred approach in any placement.

Key informants offered the following opinions about these programs:

- The training element of WBT is significant enough for respondents to consider it a unique program (n=9).
- Work Placement is typically targeted to specific groups (Social Assistance, people with disabilities, First Nations peoples) (n=6). This is due to the client-driven nature of the program, and the fact that it is administered by CSCES. One respondent said that JS/FS should become more client-focused.
- A few respondents recommended that Work Placement and WBT be combined in the future, as it can create confusion among employers and clients when both programs serve the same goal (n=3). However, most staff and managers support the current separation of the programs.

Bridging

Bridging programs provide pre-employment training to individuals lacking basic employment skills. Bridging programs have the potential to be integrated with both Quick Skills and Work-Based Training, although they are more likely to be combined with the former. Key informants offered the following observations:

- Some Bridging programs have been effectively linked with JS/FS in the past (n=7).
- Two respondents report that linkages between JS/FS and Bridging programs could be stronger. Another claimed that this would be difficult, as JS/FS programs are handled by SIAST/Regional Colleges, while Bridging funds are managed by CSCES. This change has made it more difficult for Regional Colleges to deal with multi-barriered clients, since they were previously able to offer 12 to 15 weeks of pre-employment/life skills.

Key informants offer no clear advice on how to better integrate Bridging and WBT programs. It appears that the divided jurisdiction for these programs is the main reason that these programs are not better integrated. Work Placement/Community Works could be integrated with Work-Based Training, if rules governing the latter were changed. However, these programs operate with different philosophies. Work Placement / Community Works offer work experience, usually in lower skill industries. The JS/FS Program focuses on skill development, credited training, and meeting the needs of employers.

Observation: Combining Work Placement and Bridging with Work-Based Training may compromise the Program without providing clear advantages, with the exception of increased access by underrepresented groups. Employers may withdraw their support if their discretion in hiring is weakened. At the same time, administering the program through one organization (CSCES or SIAST/Regional Colleges) might reduce some of the "turf war" over clients.

5.2 To what extent has JS/FS developed partnerships?

Partnerships are developed through two main processes: Sector Partnerships and regional/local training needs assessments. In some cases, these processes have enhanced pre-existing relationships, while in others they have fostered new linkages between government, private companies, and community-based agencies.

5.2.1 Regional/local training needs assessments

These planning processes typically involve CSCES, Regional Colleges, and SIAST representatives. Other groups include government agencies (e.g., Justice, Social Services), Chambers of Commerce, industry associations, large employers, HRDC, Tribal Councils, CBOs (e.g., Saskatchewan Abilities Council), Regional Economic Development Agencies (REDAs), and Regional Inter-Sectoral Committees (RICs).

In the last year, the Regional Services Branch (RSB) received the responsibility to coordinate the needs assessment process in each region. The RSB regional offices now serve as the focal point for the process, consulting with a variety of organizations. Some key informants suggested that RSB staff take a different perspective of regional planning than that of SIAST/Regional Colleges, as the former takes a broader perspective of human resource needs, rather than dealing with the immediate issue of matching the supply of training to the demand. The assessment process would likely benefit from both perspectives being integrated.

In general, field staff support the regional training needs assessment processes, but recommend improvements. Over one-quarter (28%) of field staff report that the local/regional training needs assessments are "effective as is;" 40% said they need some improvement, while 12% said they require "major improvements."

Suggestions for improving the process include:

- *More employer involvement (n=8 of 60).* A few field staff noted that employers and industry are poorly integrated into the planning process. The Chamber of Commerce is the main link, and often does not represent all employers. That said, relationships with industry are reportedly stronger now than in the past. RSB staff bridge the gap between employers and training service providers. Some suggested a regular survey of employers.
- *Streamlined and timely assessments (n=4).* A few reported the release of outdated information. Needs assessments are often too slow to develop, and the information may be dated by the time the formal report is submitted. The informal and ongoing processes that underpin regional assessments are more valuable, and provide information more rapidly. A method of communicating training needs more quickly would appear to benefit the process.
- *Better synthesis between local, regional, and provincial training needs planning (n=3).* A few suggested that PSEST ensure regional assessments are coordinated with an overall provincial training plan.

Most of the above comments represent positions held by a small number of staff. For the most part, the formal needs assessment process does not appear to have made a major contribution to the program. It appears that informal processes, such as one-to-one contact among employers and training institutions, are more important planning approaches.

5.2.2 Sector partnerships

The Sector Partnerships program unites industry associations, community groups, and trainers to develop training strategies, identify potential growth areas, and cultivate continuous learning within the workplace. It also develops linkages among Métis, First Nations, and labour organizations to ensure their involvement in industry training and employment strategies. The JS/FS Program provides up to $50,000 in provincial funding for strategic planning to meet industry skill needs.

Key informants believe that Sector Partnerships extend partnerships between government, employers, and industry[9]. However, some claimed that partnerships have waned in the last two years due to the lack of follow-up funding. According to two key informants, sector partnerships now have less influence in sustaining partnerships.

Over one-quarter (27%) of field staff report that Sector Partnerships are "effective as is," 38% said that they need some improvement, while 8% said that they require "major improvements." An equal number (27%) chose not to provide an assessment. According to field staff, Sector Partnerships assist the local/regional planning process in two ways:

- providing information and trends (e.g., sectoral employment rates) that enhance the planning process (n=8 of 60).
- bringing stakeholders together around the same table to discuss concerns, express views, and obtain direct feedback (n=3).

Staff offered limited suggestions for improving the Sector Partnerships process:

- Extending sector partnerships to rural Saskatchewan, where there is a need for more economic planning (n=2).
- Further involvement of regional staff in the planning process (n=2), although it is unclear whether this is a sector partnership or a regional planning issue.
- Regionally specific information for useful planning (n=2).

[9] Several sector partners were included in key informant interviews.

5.3 How is the program being marketed?

The issue of program marketing divides key informants and field staff. Possibly reflecting the Program's philosophical divide between employer-driven and client-driven aspects. Marketing for Quick Skills targets trainees, whereas marketing of Work-Based Training focuses on contacting employers. According to a few key informants, funding constraints may limit program marketing. Since the program is not currently under-subscribed, increased marketing may result in longer waiting lists, because the training subsidy is capped. This may produce an adverse reaction from employers and potential trainees.

5.3.1 Marketing the program to trainees

As noted above, Quick Skills training is typically marketed to trainees, as employers often recruit Work-Based trainees independently. It is difficult to test the effectiveness of marketing without asking non-trainees whether they had heard of the program, and if they would try to access training if they had. When you only speak to trainees, you can only learn what was effective, not what could be effective.

Most trainees find out about training programs through an employer (42%), advertising (newspaper, radio) (19%), or by word-of-mouth (14%). Quick Skills trainees were more likely to hear about the program through the newspaper (27%) or advertising (7%), while those in a Work-Based program learned about the JS/FS Program from an employer (77% for Re-Training and 61% for Training).

These findings suggest that only one-third of trainees are referred to the program by either training providers (SIAST, Regional Colleges, CBOs) or government staff (CSCES, social worker, or HRDC). Most find out about it through advertising or direct networking with employers. It is important to note that this includes trainees in the discontinued Re-Training program, where most found out about the program from an employer.

Table 62: How did you find out about the JS/FS Program? (n=1,008)

Source of information about JS/FS	WBT (n=447)	RT (n=149)	QS (n=442)	Total (n=1008)
From an employer	61%	77%	10%	42%
Word-of-mouth / Family / Friends	11%	7%	18%	16%
Newspaper	6%	5%	27%	14%
SIAST or Regional College staff	6%	5%	11%	8%
CSCES staff	4%	1%	8%	5%
Other advertising (e.g., radio)	2%	3%	9%	5%
Social worker	3%	-	6%	4%
Other training deliver (CBO, private school)	4%	2%	5%	4%
HRDC staff	1%	-	1%	1%
Government Department	1%	-	3%	1%
Band / Tribal Council	1%	1%	2%	1%
Other	<1%	1%	1%	1%
DK/NR	4%	1%	4%	4%

Source: Survey of trainees.

5.3.2 Marketing the program to employers

As is the case with trainees, it is hard to identify the most effective marketing techniques without a non-trainee sample. Based on the employer survey, it is possible to find out what has worked in the past, but not whether employers in general are aware of the program.

Most participating employers learned about the program through SIAST/Regional Colleges (40%) or by word-of-mouth (39%). Others heard about it through CSCES centres (16%), advertisements (13%), or training consultants (12%). Direct marketing appears to be the best means of telling employers about the program. The longevity of the program may also contribute to general knowledge of the program.

Table 5.3: How did you hear about the program? (n=195)

Response	%
SIAST/Regional College	40%
Word-of-mouth / referral	39%
CSCES	16%
Advertisements (newspaper, direct mail, radio)	13%
Training consultants	12%
HRDC	6%
From the applicant	3%
Other	7%
Don't know/No response	3%

Note: Respondents could choose more than one answer. Totals may sum to more than 100%.
Source: Survey of employers.

5.3.3 Suggestions for improving marketing

Regional Colleges/SIAST staff often market the program individually to employers, which they claim is the most effective approach (n=7). Word-of-mouth and longevity of the program have also helped in the area of promotion (n=6).

That said, several key informants suggested more targeted marketing, since in their view, uptake is slower than anticipated in some regions. In particular, staff (n=7) reported that smaller businesses are harder to reach, as they may not have used training in the past.

Field staff also share this view: only 5% of staff said that current marketing approaches are adequate, while one-third said that more marketing would help.

[redacted] to reach trainees?

	Trainees	Employers
Yes, there is enough	5%	5%
Yes, but more would help	32%	33%
No, more is needed	47%	52%
Not sure / No response	17%	10%
Total	101%	100%

Note: Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
Source: Survey of staff.

Field staff and key informants offered the following suggestions:

- Marketing the entire portfolio of provincial programs would help employers identify the most suitable program. It may also be a more efficient way of informing employers of the current training situation.
- Forty percent (40%) of field staff suggested assigning more funding and responsibility to SIAST/Regional Colleges to market the program to trainees. Just over one-third (35%) suggests that this would also improve marketing to employers. Some field staff support the further devolution of responsibility of the program to training deliverers. Key informants added that joint marketing might also be effective.
- Field staff suggest that trainees could learn more about the program through marketing by CBOs and through referrals from CSCES. This type of marketing could link underrepresented groups to the program, since certain CBOs provide services specific to underrepresented groups. According to key informants, this may direct some clients to Work Placement instead, which may be a better match than Work-Based Training.

	Trainees	Employers
Better marketing of all provincial training programs	42%	50%
More funding from PSEST	40%	35%
More responsibility given to SIAST / RC to market the program	40%	35%
More direct marketing by CBOs	28%	20%
More marketing by PSEST	27%	33%
More client referrals from CSCES	23%	15%
Others	30%	20%
Don't know / no response	12%	15%

Note: Respondents could choose more than one answer. Totals may sum to more than 100%.
Source: Survey of staff.

Observation: Increased marketing could raise the participation of smaller employers in more remote areas. However, without raising the level of funding for training subsidies, expectations of employers may not be fulfilled. This could lead to disappointment and less enthusiasm for the Program by those who are essential to its delivery.

5.4 Reliance on income support

Some Quick Skills participants require income support. Those with low incomes who are enrolled in Quick Skills courses of 4 to 12 weeks in length may use the PTA.[10] EI clients can support themselves through Part 1 benefits and/or by using the Skills Training Benefit (STB) to cover some costs. Student loans support longer-term credited training (more than 12 weeks).

Based on the client survey, one-third of Quick Skills students do not appear to receive any income support. One-fifth (20%) collect the PTA while in training, 16% are on EI, 8% receive Social Assistance, and 7% use student loans.

Type of income support	%
None	33%
PTA	20%
EI	16%
Social Assistance	8%
Student loans	7%
STB	3%
Band funding	3%
Employer	3%
Other	5%
Don't know / No response	6%

Note: Respondents could choose more than one answer. Totals may sum to more than 100%.
Source: Survey of trainees.

10 Income support for low-income persons in training would have been previously covered through Social Assistance.

When asked for ways to improve the Quick Skills program, 28% of field staff recommended improving income support for training, suggesting the following:

- Longer-term Quick Skills courses should be eligible for the PTA. Currently, longer-term courses are only student loan eligible, making them inaccessible to Social Assistance recipients or other low-income persons who have previously defaulted on loans.

Similar concerns about the PTA were raised during the evaluation of that program, although most clients report that financial support is adequate, and is the same or slightly higher than support previously provided under Social Assistance. Determining how to support longer-term training is a broader policy issue for government. Supporting longer-term training through the PTA would certainly broaden access to the program, particularly among Social Assistance recipients, but the initiative would be costly. This decision has implications beyond the JS/FS Program, and is not central to this evaluation. An evaluation of income support issues is beyond the scope of the JS/FS Program evaluation.

5.5 How extensive is local and regional decision-making?

Local and regional decision-making is integral to the JS/FS Program. The program is intended to react quickly to industry demand, requiring that institutions process applications quickly and that established processes exist to identify when needs must be met. Field staff support this delivery model.

- Almost half (47%) of field staff consider regional decision-making a "very important" part of the JS/FS Program, while 35% consider it "somewhat important."

- Almost three-quarters (73%) said local decision-making is very important, while 13% said it is somewhat important.

Most key informants agreed JS/FS has a high degree of local and regional decision making, since the program is delivered through SIAST and Regional Colleges. However, few could assess whether there was consistency at the local level. Those who offered an opinion were divided:

- One in four field staff (n=15 of 60) report that responsibility should be at the regional level, to account for variation in the labour market. Meeting the varying demands of trainees and employers in the region requires flexibility at the local level.

- At the same time, approximately one in six field staff (n=10) said that ensuring equal access for clients and employers necessitates consistency. Having a common set of rules also reduces confusion among potential trainees. Three people said that current program rules ensure this level of consistency.

5.6 How flexible and responsive is the program?

As noted in Section 3.1.2, JS/FS emphasizes the provision of credited training, unlike other wage subsidy programs in the Province. Prior to the program, most training was delivered in the classroom, and there was relatively little in the way of formal on-the-job training. When the program was created, SIAST was asked to adapt existing curricula and develop appropriate training modules for industries where "standards" were not formally established. In general, employers, field staff, and key informants identified that the JS/FS Program as flexible and responsive to the needs of employers.

As indicated earlier in the report, employers are satisfied with the way that JS/FS staff tailor training to meet their needs (detailed findings are outlined in Table 7, Section 3.1.2). According to employers, the JS/FS Program's flexibility meets their needs.

Field staff also support the idea of program flexibility and responsiveness. Most (83%) cited the importance of involving employers in planning and recruitment, while a similar proportion identified the importance of the program's "flexibility to design a training program to meet employers needs."

- About two-thirds (67%) of field staff said that quick processing of applications was very important, while 58% said that giving employers the ability to hire who they want was very important.

[illegible] how important are the

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Neutral	Not Important	Not at all Important	Not sure / NR
Employer involvement in planning and recruiting	83%	15%	2%	-	-	-
Flexibility to design a training program to meet employers' training needs	82%	13%	5%	-	-	-
Quick processing of program application	67%	27%	5%	-	-	2%
Giving employers the ability to decide who to hire	58%	32%	7%	3%	-	-

Note: Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
Source: Survey of staff.

Key informants had the following comments about program flexibility:

- According to key informants, SIAST tailors courses to meet the needs of employers. This works most effectively where standards already exist. Many courses are developed as modules, and are more easily customized as a result (n=5).

- SIAST has had to adapt to the delivery of Work-Based Training. According to a few key informants (n=3), some SIAST staff were initially resistant to this new delivery model, and it has taken time for many to accept Work-Based Training as an alternative to classroom-based training. SIAST has had to work at adapting programs to meet employer needs.

- Staff report that Regional Colleges are responsive in developing programs. Some key informants indicated that they have a history of finding solutions to meet training needs, and are well grounded in developing partnerships for delivering programs (n=4).

- Two managers suggested the need for more flexibility when determining course criteria (new position versus vacancy). According to them, the number of employers who would participate in the program would increase. They stated that this is particularly notable in rural areas where funding is not available for short-term vacancies, especially when the job is not classified as a "new position." It also affects those whose skills have become dated and are looking to make a career change, but are employed at the time they wish to change positions. This appears to be an attempt to find a way to re-introduce the re-training option.

5.7 How effectively is the program managed?

According to field staff, most administrative processes work well, although many were unable to offer specific suggestions. Those who could, said that better program marketing and follow-up on trainees and employers would help. In general, staff reported that application processing and trainee monitoring are effective.

SIAST/Regional Colleges respondents were more likely to rate the processes as effective, while PSEST/CSCES staff were more likely to suggest a need for improvements or to be unsure/to give no response (see Table 58).

- Just over one-third of respondents (35%) rated processing trainee applications for Quick Skills and Work-Based Training programs as effective.

- A similar number (35%) said that the process of "assisting employers with proposals" was effective, while 37% said that it needs some improvement.

- One-quarter of field staff (28%) said that the process of "monitoring trainees' progress while in training" was effective, while 48% said that it needs some improvement.

Respondents singled out two areas as requiring "major improvement":

- Fifteen percent (15%) said that more work needs to be done in "communicating with employers who have never participated in the program." Thirteen percent (13%) said that this process was effective as is, while 48% said that it requires some improvement.

- A similar proportion recommended improving how trainees' and employers' outcomes are tracked (15% and 17% respectively). That said, a higher proportion thought that these processes were effective as is (27% - trainees, 30% - employers), or require some improvement.

Rate the effectiveness of the following administrative processes in your region:

	Effective	Needs some improvement	Needs major improvement	Not sure / NR
Assisting employers with proposals	35%	37%	3%	25%
Monitoring trainees' progress while in training	28%	48%	3%	20%
Communicating with employers who have never participated	13%	52%	15%	20%
Processing trainee applications for Quick Skills programs	35%	20%	3%	42%
Processing trainee applications for Work-Based Training Programs	37%	30%	7%	27%
Tracking trainees' outcomes	27%	37%	15%	22%
Tracking employers' outcomes	30%	30%	17%	23%

Note: Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
Source: Survey of staff.

As a follow-up to this question, field staff offered specific ways to improve program planning and administration, and to strengthen the relationship between SIAST/Regional Colleges and PSEST/CSCES.

- *Simplify and streamline administration.* Respondents suggest removing the repetitiveness in forms and procedures for applicant approval and tracking documents. Tracking documents are often not updated. Integrating SIAST into OCSM is one way of improving this process.

- *Hire training consultants who specialize in the JS/FS Program.* At some colleges, staff find it difficult to combine their responsibilities on JS/FS and their other duties. Hiring specialized consultants would offer a higher level of service to clients.
- *Simplify the approval process.* Local approval usually involves forms being passed back and forth among SIAST/Regional Colleges and CSCES supervisors, then back to a committee, then to the employer and project manager. Layers of approval slow the system down.
- *Improve coordination between SIAST/ Regional Colleges and CSCES.* Some suggested that one agency should be given responsibility for approvals (either CSCES or SIAST/Regional Colleges), as the current divided responsibility is confusing and ineffective. One respondent claimed that this could also cause "turf wars" and result in an "administrative nightmare."
- *More lead time for planning.* Long-term sector planning, knowing budgets in advance, and clearly established goals lend stability to the system.

The JS/FS Program is effectively managed, though staff implied that more resources and a more automated application procedure would improve the process.

5.8 Relationship between SIAST/Regional Colleges and PSEST/CSCES

Approximately half (46%) of field staff said "no changes are needed in the relationship between SIAST/Regional Colleges and CSCES," or expressed uncertainty over how the relationships could be changed. The other half recommended changes that they said would improve the relationship.

- *The central issue involves program approvals for Work-Based Training.* Several staff from Regional Colleges/SIAST claim that the system would work more effectively if CSCES had an advisory role only, and was not involved in the program approval process. However, government maintains a role in this process, to ensure accountability for program spending. For most, the current approval process is effective.
- *Common goals should be pursued.* According to a few field staff, all partners should work towards similar ends, rather than "competing" for clients. This may reflect the difference between Work-Based Training and the Work Placement program, which serve similar clientele and are similar in nature, but are administratively different.

5.9 Summary

JobStart/Future Skills, and especially its Work-Based Training component, is unique and distinguishes it from programs such as Community Works and Work Placement.

The Sector Partnerships program is an important strategic planning process affecting a broader scope than the Quick Skills and Work-Based Training programs. Sector Partnerships have been effective, but their role appears to have waned. Future partnership activity will need to continue targeting key sectors where economic opportunity exists, and to develop a clearer role for these planning processes.

Marketing for Quick Skills targets trainees, whereas marketing of Work-Based Training focuses on employers. Funding constraints may limit program marketing. Since the program is not currently under-subscribed, increased marketing may result in longer waiting lists, since the total training budget is capped. In turn, this could produce an adverse reaction from employers and potential trainees, who may be disappointed when funding is not forthcoming.

The JS/FS Program is also both flexible and responsive to local labour market needs. RSB and SIAST staff jointly handle approvals and planning at the regional level, ensuring that projects are viewed within the context of local labour markets.

6.0 Best practices and lessons learned

Overall, the JobStart/Future Skills Program is successful, and well received by trainees, employers, and staff.

Lessons Learned - Trainees

- *The JS/FS Program has helped people find and maintain employment*: Work-Based Training and Re-Training provides trainees with immediate employment, with the hope that they will remain employed once training has ended. Quick Skills is supposed to be provided only in situations where jobs are available and clients are expected to find work immediately upon completion. The trainee survey confirms that these goals are being met. Approximately 88% were employed at some point following program completion. Nearly two-thirds (65%) of those in Work-Based Training remained employed at the same job by the actual/expected end of the program. Similarly, 72% of Quick Skills trainees found work within three months of completing their course.

- *The JS/FS Program leads to increased earnings and self-sufficiency:* Increased self-sufficiency is a key measure of a training programs' success. The trainee survey shows that many have benefited financially from training. After training, those who have moved on to other work show distinct increases in wages and salaries. Nearly one-third (31%) report pay increases. As a result, fewer earn under $250 per week, while more earn over $350 per week, or over $10.00 per hour.

  Overall, more people report employment after training (84%) than before (81%), and fewer report receiving Social Assistance (17% after training, compared to 27% before training) or EI support after training (23%, compared to 40% before training). Additionally, when comparing the 12 months prior to training and the 12 months after training, the average duration of Social Assistance and EI support is lower after training, which may indicate graduates' skills and/or experiences help them find a job more quickly than before training.

- *Access to training differs depending on the type of program.* Quick Skills training is more "client focused," whereas Work-Based Training focuses on the needs of employers. The PTA supports access to Quick Skills training for short-term courses; student loans support longer courses (more than 12 weeks). The

PTA enables many Social Assistance clients to access training that they could not otherwise afford. That said, PTA regulations might make longer-term Quick Skills training less accessible to Social Assistance recipients or other low-income persons who have previously defaulted on loans. These individuals cannot receive the PTA for these courses, creating a potential barrier to participation.

Work-Based Training appears to increase access regionally, but decrease access for underrepresented groups. The delivery of training within the community at the work-site improves regional access. Individuals from underrepresented groups are said to have more difficulty using Work-Based Training, due to the employer-driven nature of the program. Employers may reduce the use of the program if they lose the discretion over whom to hire.

Lessons Learned - Employers

- *JS/FS meets employers' needs:* JS/FS emphasizes the provision of credited training, unlike other wage subsidy programs. This is a strong feature of the program, and distinguishes it from other provincial training programs.

- *Employers are generally satisfied with the way that JS/FS staff tailor training to meet their needs.* Most employers report that the program is flexible enough to meet their training needs, and were satisfied with the process of determining program accreditation.

- *The JS/FS Program has fostered a learning culture.* The training subsidy makes it easier for employers to invest in training, and reduces the risk of hiring untrained persons. The "training subsidy" provides a basis for training that may not have previously existed, thereby contributing to the development of a "learning culture" within industry. The employer survey showed that most employers agree that, "the program enabled them to provide more training than normally provided to new employers." The survey of field staff found two-thirds of staff agree that, "Work-Based Training helps cultivate a learning culture among employers."

- *A large minority of staff and employers would like to see the return of Work-Based Re-Training.* Over one-third of employers agreed with the statement, "Without the program, we would not have re-trained existing employees," compared to 15% who disagreed, while the rest were neutral or were "not sure." This suggests that a higher proportion of employers view re-training as "optional", and are less likely to upgrade the skills of current employees without financial support. Nearly half (48%) of staff said that the Re-

Training program should be brought back, while 27% said the program was beneficial but not necessary.

In general, stronger support for re-training exists among Regional Colleges/SIAST staff and industry representatives than among government staff. The former support the programs, because they help employers meet their training needs.

Lessons Learned - Administration

- *Work Placement and Work-Based Training have different philosophical underpinnings, making them difficult to merge.* Work Placement and Community Works are similar to Work-Based Training, as each offers subsidies to employers. However, the Work-Based Training program emphasizes credited training tailored to the needs of employers, whereas Work Placement and Community Works do not mandate a training component as a condition for support.

- *The JS/FS Program supports local and regional decision-making.* 47% of field staff consider regional decision-making a "very important" part of the JS/FS Program, while 35% consider it "somewhat important." Nearly three-quarters (73%) said that local decision-making is very important, while 13% said it was somewhat important. Most key informants agreed that JS/FS has a high degree of local and regional decision making, as it is delivered through SIAST and Regional Colleges.

- *In general, field staff support the regional training needs assessment processes, but recommends improving it.* Over one-quarter (28%) of field staff report that the local/regional training needs assessments are effective, 40% said that they need some improvement, while 12% said that they require "major improvements." Suggestions for improving the process include: more involvement with employers; more involvement from other community stakeholders (e.g., First Nations and Métis organizations, CBOs); streamlined and timely assessments; better synthesis between local, regional, and provincial training needs during planning; more resources. Most of these comments represent minority positions among respondents; however, they do provide a good indication of what some staff recommend to improve the program.

- *Sector partnerships extend partnerships between government, employers, and industry, although some would like to see next steps and renewal.* By "renewal" key informants appear to want the plan to be more integrated with regional planning processes in

general. According to some key informants, sector partnerships assist the local/regional planning process by bringing stakeholders together around the same table to discuss concerns and express views; by providing information and trends (e.g., sectoral employment rates) that feed into the planning process; and by focusing on long-term outcomes and the sustainable delivery of programs in a region.

Summary

Among provincial training programs, the JobStart/Future Skills Program successfully satisfies the needs of trainees and employers. The program balances economic development with human resource development, benefiting individuals, industry, and the economy as a whole.

Trainees are very satisfied with the JS/FS Program. It has helped people find and maintain employment, and has lead to increased earnings and self-sufficiency. Most graduates find work immediately upon completion, and are able to increase their earnings in the process. Overall, the program has also helped people reduce their reliance on Social Assistance and Employment Insurance, and has increased attachment to the labour market.

The JS/FS Program has also met employers' needs. Employers are generally satisfied with the way that JS/FS staff tailor training to meet their needs. , believe that it has helped fostered a learning culture in the workplace, as employers are involved in delivering credited training that is more practical to their needs.

From a broader perspective, the JobStart/Future Skills Program is a useful element of the Saskatchewan training environment. Work-Based Training differs from Community Works and Work Placement, due to its "employer-focus" and emphasis on credited training. Quick Skills trainees come from many streams, with representation from all underrepresented groups. Some would prefer to see greater participation by Social Assistance recipients in the Program, and would like to direct employers to hire specific target groups. Ultimately, participation in the Program by underrepresented groups in Quick Skills training depends in part on access to income support, which consists of policies that are separate from Job Start/Future Skills. Too specific a direction on whom to hire may reduce the Program's attraction to employers, which could compromise its impact.

APPENDIX A
CLIENT SURVEY

JOBSTART/ FUTURES SKILLS TRAINEE SURVEY

00/12/01 13:31

1: **INTRO**

Hello, is this $N ?. *** DIAL THIS PHONE #: <INSPH > IF DIFFERENT THAN ABOVE *** CALLBACK INFO: NAME: <NAME > GENERAL INFORMATION: <INFO1 > <INFO2 >

(ANYTHING IN UPPER CASE IS NOT TO BE READ TO RESPONDENT)

(1/ 42)

YES, Continue with survey	1	D	=> INTR1
Terminate Call	2		=> INT

00/11/30 20:15

2: **INTR1**

I would like to speak with <FNAME > <LNAME >. (IF NOT AT HOME/INCONVENIENT, THEN ASK WHEN WOULD BE A GOOD TIME TO CALL.)

PHONE NUMBER: <INSPH >

(1/ 43)

Continue	1	D	=> INTR2
CallbackCall	3		=> INT01
Person not at this number - GO TO INTR7	4		=> INTR7

3: **INTR2**

Hello, my name is _____ with Prairie Research Associates. We are an independent research firm conducting an evaluation of the JobStart/Future Skills program on behalf of the Saskatchewan government. (PROMPT: The JobStart/Future Skills program is a program that supports people in work-based training or classroom-based skills training in support of employment opportunities)

----------> NEXT SCREEN TO CONTINUE

(1/ 44)

Continue	1	D	
CallbackCall	3		=> INT01

00/11/30 11:34

4: **INTR3**

We are conducting a random telephone survey of past JobStart/Future Skills participants to gather their opinions and thoughts about the program. We understand you were a participant of the program. (START DATE IS PROVIDED) PROGRAM NAME: <QSDES >/<RTDES >/<TRDES >

MON/YR IN PROGRAM: <QSMON>,<QS_YR>/<RTMON>,<RT_YR>/<TRMON>,<TR_YR>

(1/ 45)

Yes, continue	1	D	=> INTR5
No - was not in program	2		=> TERM
CallbackCall	3		=> INT01

5: **INTR5**

(IF YES) Would you have the time to answer some questions? Your responses will be kept confidential, all information will be grouped together, and no individual responses will be shared with the government. Everything you say is completely confidential.

(1/ 46)

Continue	1	D	=> Q1
CallbackCall	2		=> INT01

6: **INTR7**

[redacted]

Do you (or anyone else in your household) happen to know another telephone number that <FNAME > <LNAME > can be reached at?

(1/ 47)

Yes, GO TO PHONE NUMBER AND REVISE	1	D	=> INSPH
Don't know their new telephone number - TERMINATE	2		=> INT
Never heard of this person - TERMINATE	3		=> INT

7: **TERM**

[redacted]

Those are all the questions I have for you. Thank you for your time.

(1/ 48)

GO TO CALL STATUS SCREEN & CODE AS NON-QUALIFIED	1	=> INT01

8: **SURID**

[redacted]

(1/ 49)

9: **FNAME**

[redacted]

(1/ 53)

10: **LNAME**

[redacted]

(1/ 78)

00/11/30 10:36

11: **INSPH**

[redacted]

INTERVIEWER: REVISE PHONE NUMBER AND GO TO NEXT SCREEN (INTR1), DIAL NEW PHONE NUMBER AND PROCEED WITH SURVEY. REVISE PHONE # IN THIS FORMAT: 306-555-5555

(1/ 103)

999-999-9999

00/11/30 10:37

12: **QSDES**

=> INTRO else => INTRO if INTR1=4

[redacted]

(1/ 115)

00/11/24 10:28

13: **QSMON**

[redacted]

(1/ 165)

JAN ..... JAN
FEB ..... FEB
MAR ..... MAR
APR ..... APR
MAY ..... MAY
JUN ..... JUN
JUL ..... JUL
AUG ..... AUG
SEP ..... SEP
OCT ..... OCT
NOV ..... NOV
DEC ..... DEC

00/12/07 11:46

14: **QS_YR**

[redacted]

(1/ 168)

1995 1995
1996 1996
1997 1997
1998 1998
1999 1999
2000 2000

15: **RTDES**

[redacted]

(1/ 172)

00/11/24 10:28

16: **RTMON**

[redacted]

(1/ 222)

JAN	JAN
FEB	FEB
MAR	MAR
APR	APR
MAY	MAY
JUN	JUN
JUL	JUL
AUG	AUG
SEP	SEP
OCT	OCT
NOV	NOV
DEC	DEC

00/12/07 11:47

17: **RT_YR**

[redacted]

(1/ 225)

1995	1995
1996	1996
1997	1997
1998	1998
1999	1999
2000	2000

00/11/24 10:28

18: **TRDES**

[redacted]

(1/ 229)

00/11/24 10:28

19: **TRMON**

[redacted]

(1/ 279)

JAN	JAN
FEB	FEB
MAR	MAR
APR	APR
MAY	MAY
JUN	JUN
JUL	JUL
AUG	AUG
SEP	SEP
OCT	OCT
NOV	NOV
DEC	DEC

00/12/07 11:47

20: **TR_YR**

[redacted]

(1/ 282)

1995.....1995
1996.....1996
1997.....1997
1998.....1998
1999.....1999
2000.....2000

21: **SKIPB**

=> INTR1 else => INTR1 if INTR7=1

[redacted]

(1/ 286)

22: **INT01**

[redacted]

---------- RECORD CALL STATUS BELOW ----------

(1/ 287)

YES, CONTINUE WITH SURVEY	01	N	
Hard appointment	04		=> NAME
Soft appointment	05		=> NAME
Not in service	10		=> END
Fax/Modem line	11		=> END
Business line	12		=> END
Household refusal	20		=> END
Respondent refusal	21		=> END
Respondent cannot be reached at this number / any number / Respondent not known by anyone at this address	22		=> END
Refusal at introduction	23		=> END
Termination - Mid interview	24	N	=> END
Busy	30		=> END
No answer	31		=> END
Answering machine	32		=> END
Other	50	O	=> END
Language/Heath/Hearing problem	60		=> END
Non-qualified respondent	70		=> END

23: **Q1**

Q1. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes. May I proceed?

(1/ 289)

Yes.....1
No - PROCEED TO CONVERT -(NOTHING ADDED YET).....2
Callback / terminate.....3

00/12/07 15:26

24: **Q2**

[redacted]

Q2. Our records indicate that you participated in a <QSDES >/<RTDES >/<TRDES > in <QSMON>,<QS_YR>/<RTMON>,<RT_YR>/<TRMON>,<TR_YR> as part of the JobStart/Future Skills Program? (INTERVIEWER: CONFIRM PERSON RECALLS TAKING THESE PROGRAMS - IF THEY DIDN'T KNOW THAT THESE WERE PART OF THE JSFS PROGRAM, EXPLAIN THAT THEY WERE)

SOME RESPONDENTS HAVE TAKEN 2 PROGRAMS

(1/ 290 - 291)

TRAINING	1	
RE-TRAINING (DO NOT USE UNLESS LISTED)	2	
QUICK SKILLS	3	
Don't know	8	=> TERM
No response	9	=> TERM

25: **Q3**

=> Q13 if NOT Q2=1

[redacted]

Q3. What type of company did you work for while receiving work-based training? (DO NOT READ) ----- (IF UNSURE, ASK WHAT THEY DO)

COMPLETE THIS SECTION IF Q2=1 ELSE GO TO PART C

(1/ 292 - 294 - 296)

Manufacturing	01	
Processing	02	
Tourism and Hospitality	03	
Energy	04	
Information Technology (includes film & video)	05	
Agriculture	06	
Resources (mining, forestry)	07	
Construction	08	
Retail	09	
Health (Home Care, Health Aide)	10	
Transportation (Trucking)	11	
Other (SPECIFY)	66	O
_____		
_____		
_____		
Don't Know	88	X
No Response	99	X

26: **Q4**

Q4. What was the wage? ENTER WAGE IN DOLLARS AND THEN GO TO THE NEXT SCREEN TO INDICATE WHETHER PER HOUR, WEEK, MONTH OR YEAR

(1/ 298)

$R.2 0 88887

DK / NR	88888	=> Q5

27: **Q4A**

Q4A. What was the wage? ENTER WHETHER BY HOUR, WEEK, MONTH OR YEAR

(1/ 306)

Per Hour 01
Per Week 02
Per Month 03
Per Year 04
DK / NR 88

00/11/30 11:48

28: **Q5**

Q5. Approximately how many hours per week did you work? (NOTE: INCLUDE BOTH TIME AT THE JOB AND ANY ADDITIONAL TIME SPENT IN TRAINING OUTSIDE THE WORKPLACE)

(1/ 308)

$R 0 87
DK / NR 88

29: **Q6**

Q6. What type of training was involved? (READ LIST - check all that apply)

(1/ 310 - 312 - 314)

On the job training by a supervisor or other employee 01
Correspondence learning 02
Training by a community organization or other privatetrainer 03
Classroom training at SIAST or a Regional College 04
Other (SPECIFY) ..... 66 O

_____
_____
_____

Don't Know ..... 88 X
No Response ..... 99 X

30: **Q7**

Q7. Did you complete your work-based training program?

(1/ 316)

Yes, complete 1
Currently enrolled ..... 2 => Q13
Did not complete ..... 3 => Q9
Don't Know ..... 8 => Q13
No Response ..... 9 => Q13

00/11/30 11:52

31: **Q8**

Q8. What certification or credit for training did you get? (e.g., what degree or certificate) (READ LIST)

(1/ 317 - 319 - 321)

SIAST/Regional College certification - course credit	01	
Industry Credit	02	
A letter stating that you had attained specific skills	03	
No certification offered	04	
Failed exam / failed certification	05	
Other (SPECIFY)	66	O
_____		
_____		
_____		
Don't Know	88	X
No Response	99	X

32: **Q9**

=> +1 if NOT Q7=3

Q9. Why didn't you finish the program? (DO NOT READ)

(1/ 323 - 325 - 327)

Had another job	01	
Did not like the job	02	
Went back to SIAST/Regional College	03	
Went to other private training	04	
Went to university	05	
Company closed	06	
Transportation problems	07	
Changed career plans	08	
Health problems	09	
Pregnancy	10	
Family issues	11	
Other (SPECIFY)	66	O
_____		
_____		
_____		
Don't Know	88	X
No Response	99	X

33: **Q10**

=> Q13 if NOT Q7=1

Q10. After your program was completed, did you remain at your job?

(1/ [illegible])

Yes	1	
No	2	=> Q13
Don't Know	8	=> Q13
No Response	9	=> Q13

34: **Q11**

Q11. Approximately how many months did you work at that company after the training program ended? (IF STILL EMPLOYED, COUNT MONTHS UP TO THE PRESENT.) ------- (READ)

(1/ 330)

0 to 3 months 1
4 to 6 months 2
6 months to a year 3
1 to 2 years 4
More than 2 years 5
Don't Know 8
No Response 9

00/11/30 11:53

35: **Q12**

Q12. Did you receive an increase in pay? (IF YES) How much did you earn per hour? (ENTER USING DECIMAL POINT, (e.g. 6.50)

(1/ 331)

$R.2 00.01 30.00
No Raise 00.00
No Response 99999

36: **Q13**

=> Q19 if NOT Q2=2

Q13. I'd like to ask you several questions about your work-based retraining program. What type of company did you work for while receiving retraining under the JobStart/Future Skills program? ----- (DO NOT READ)

(1/ 336 - 338 - 340)

Manufacturing 01
Processing 02
Tourism and Hospitality 03
Energy 04
Information Technology (includes film & video) 05
Agriculture 06
Resources (mining, forestry) 07
Construction 08
Retail 09
Health (Home Care, Health Aide) 10
Transportation (Trucking) 11
Other (SPECIFY) ..... 66 O

_____
_____
_____

Don't Know ..... 88 X
No Response ..... 99 X

37: **Q14**

Q14. What was the wage? ENTER WAGE IN DOLLARS AND THEN GO TO THE NEXT SCREEN TO INDICATE WHETHER PER HOUR, WEEK, MONTH OR YEAR

(1/ 342)

$R.2 0 88887
DK / NR ..... 88888 => Q15

38: **Q14A**

Q14A. What was the wage? ENTER WHETHER BY HOUR, WEEK, MONTH OR YEAR

(1/ 350)

Per Hour 01
Per Week 02
Per Month 03
Per Year 04
DK / NR 88

00/11/30 11:49

39: **Q15**

Q15. Approximately how many hours per week did you work? (NOTE: INCLUDE BOTH TIME AT THE WORKPLACE AND ANY TIME SPENT TRAINING OUTSIDE THE WORKPLACE)

(1/ 352)

$R 0 87
DK / NR 88

40: **Q16**

Q16. What type of training was involved? (READ LIST - check all that apply)

(1/ 354 - 356 - 358)

On the job training by a supervisor or other employee 01
Correspondence learning 02
Training by a community organization or other privatetrainer 03
Classroom training at SIAST or a Regional College 04
Other (SPECIFY) ..... 66 O

_____
_____
_____

Don't Know ..... 88 X
No Response ..... 99 X

00/11/30 11:53

41: **Q17**

Q17. What certification or credit for training did you get? (e.g., what degree or certificate) (READ LIST)

(1/ 360 - 362 - 364)

SIAST/Regional College certification - course credit	01	
Industry Credit	02	
A letter stating that you had attained specific skills	03	
No certification offered	04	
Failed exam / failed certification	05	
Did not complete course / training	00	X => Q19
Other (SPECIFY)	66	O
_____		
_____		
_____		
Don't Know	88	X
No Response	99	X

00/11/30 11:54

42: **Q18**

Q18. Did you receive an increase in pay? (IF YES) How much did you earn per hour? (ENTER USING DECIMAL POINT,ie: 6.50)

(1/ 366)

$R.2 00.01 30.00

No Raise	00.00
No Response	99999

43: **Q19**

=> Q31 if NOT Q2=3

Q19. I'd like to ask you several questions about your classroom-based Quick Skills training. What type of course did you take? (PROMPT: What was the course's name?) TYPE OF COURSE (IF GIVEN) - DO NOT READ "QUICK SKILLS": <QSDES >

(1/ 371 - 373 - 375)

Course Name (SPECIFY)	66	O
_____		
_____		
_____		
Can't Recall	88	X
No Response	99	X

44: **Q20**

Q20. Did the course lead to certification? (e.g., a degree or certificate)

(1/ 377)

Yes	1
No	2
Don't Know	8
No Response	9

45: **Q21**

Q21. What type of income support, if any, did you receive while in the course? (DO NOT READ - PROMPT IF NECESSARY)

(1/ 378 - 380 - 382)

Did not receive any income support	00	
Provincial Training Allowance (PTA)	01	
Skills Training Benefit (STB)	02	
Employment Insurance	03	
Student Loans	04	
Social Assistance	05	
Northern Training Program (NTP)	06	
Band Funding	07	
Other (SPECIFY)	66	O
_____		
_____		
_____		
Don't Know	88	X
No Response	99	X

46: **Q22**

Q22. Did you complete your training program?

(1/ 384)

Yes, complete	1	=> Q24
Currently enrolled	2	=> Q24
No, did not complete	3	
Don't Know	8	=> Q24
No Response	9	=> Q24

47: **Q23**

=> +1 if NOT Q22=3

Q23. Why didn't you finish the program? (DO NOT READ)

(1/ 385 - 387 - 389)

Found a job	01	
Enrolled in a different program at SIAST/Regional College	02	
Went to other private training	03	
Went to university	04	
Transportation problems	05	
Changed career plans	06	
Health problems	07	
Pregnancy	08	
Family issues	09	
Other (SPECIFY)	66	O
_____		
_____		
_____		
Don't Know	88	X
No Response	99	X

48: **Q24**

Q24. Did you expect to work immediately after completing your training as a result of prior planning, such as an agreement with an employer?

(1/ 391)

Yes 1
No 2
Don't Know 8
No Response 9

00/12/01 13:31

49: **Q25**

Q25. How long after your program ended did you begin work? (DO NOT READ)
(IF THEY DID NOT COMPLETE, ASK "How long after you left your program")

(1/ 392)

Did not find work ..... 0 => Q39
0 to 3 months 1
4 to 6 months 2
7 months to 1 year 4
More than 1 year 5
Don't Know ..... 8 => Q39
No Response ..... 9 => Q39

00/12/01 13:31

50: **Q26**

Q26. What type of company did you work for following your training? (NOTE: FIRST JOB AFTER TRAINING) (DO NOT READ)

(1/ 393 - 395 - 397)

Manufacturing 01
Processing 02
Tourism and Hospitality 03
Energy 04
Information Technology (includes film & video) 05
Agriculture 06
Resources (mining, forestry) 07
Construction 08
Retail 09
Health (Home Care, Health Aide) 10
Transportation (Trucking) 11
Other (SPECIFY) ..... 66 O

_____

_____

_____

Don't Know ..... 88 X
No Response ..... 99 X

51: **Q27**

Q27. What was the wage? ENTER WAGE IN DOLLARS AND THEN GO TO THE NEXT SCREEN TO INDICATE WHETHER PER HOUR, WEEK, MONTH OR YEAR

(1/ 399)

$R.2 0 88887

DK / NR ..... 88888 => Q28

52: **Q27A**

Q27A. What was the wage? ENTER WHETHER BY HOUR, WEEK, MONTH OR YEAR

(1/ 407)

Per Hour 01
Per Week 02
Per Month 03
Per Year 04
DK / NR 88

53: **Q28**

Q28. Approximately how many hours per week did you work?

(1/ 409)

$R 0 87

DK / NR 88

00/11/30 12:00

54: **Q29**

Q29. To what extent did your course or training help you get the job? (READ)

(1/ 411)

A lot 4
A little 3
Not very much 2
Not at all 1
Don't Know 8
No Response 9

55: **Q30**

Q30. How many months were you employed there? (IF CURRENT, COUNT UP TO THE PRESENT MONTH)?

(1/ 412)

$R 1 60

Less than 1 month 00
Don't Know ..... 88 X
No Response ..... 99 X

00/12/01 18:23

56: **Q31**

[redacted]

Q31. After you completed your training, were you employed with someone OTHER THAN the employer from whom..... you received on the job-training / Or

you worked for immediately after completing a Quick Skills course? (PRMOPT: We are referring to the most recent JobStart/Future Skills training)

(1/ 414)

Yes 1
No.....2 => Q39
Don't Know .....8 => Q39
No Response.....9 => Q39

57: **Q32**

Q32. Why did you look for other employment? (DO NOT READ)

(1/ 415 - 417 - 419 - 421 - 423)

Higher wages.....01
Better employer.....02
Better working conditions 03
Better benefits 04
Moved 05
More room for promotion/skills development 06
Laid off.....07
Other (SPECIFY).....66 O

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Don't Know .....88 X
No Response.....99 X

00/12/01 15:19

58: **Q33**

Q33. How many other jobs have you had since completing your program?

(1/ 425)

$R 2 60
Only 1 job.....01
Don't Know .....88 X
No Response.....99 X

00/11/30 10:52

59: Q34

Q34. Please think of the job that you worked at the longest. What type of company did you work for? (DO NOT READ)

(1/ 427)

Manufacturing	01	
Processing	02	
Tourism and Hospitality	03	
Energy	04	
Information Technology (includes film & video)	05	
Agriculture	06	
Resources (mining, forestry)	07	
Construction	08	
Retail	09	
Health (Home Care, Health Aide)	10	
Transportation (Trucking)	11	
Other (SPECIFY)	66	O
Don't Know	88	X
No Response	99	X

00/11/30 10:52

60: Q35

Q35. What was the wage? ENTER WAGE IN DOLLARS AND THEN GO TO THE NEXT SCREEN TO INDICATE WHETHER PER HOUR, WEEK, MONTH OR YEAR

(NOTE: The job that you worked at the longest)

(1/ 429)

$R.2 0 88887

DK / NR ..... 88888 => Q36

00/11/30 10:52

61: Q35A

Q35A. What was the wage? ENTER WHETHER BY HOUR, WEEK, MONTH OR YEAR

(NOTE: The job that you worked at the longest)

(1/ 437)

Per Hour	01
Per Week	02
Per Month	03
Per Year	04
DK / NR	88

00/11/30 10:52

62: **Q36**

Q36. Approximately how many hours per week did you work?
(NOTE: The job that you worked at the longest)

(1/ 439)

$R 0 87
DK / NR 88

00/11/30 12:11

63: **Q37**

Q37. To what extent did your previous JobStart/Future Skills experience and training help you get the job? (NOTE: We referring to the "longest job") (READ)
(NOTE: The job that you worked at the longest)

(1/ 441)

A lot 4
A little 3
Not very much 2
Not at all 1
Don't Know 8
No Response 9

64: **Q38**

Q38. How many months were you employed there? (IF CURRENTLY EMPLOYED, COUNT UP TO THE PRESENT MONTH)?

(1/ 442)

$R 1 60
Less than 1 month 00
Don't Know ..... 88 X
No Response ..... 99 X

65: **Q39**

Q39. Since completing your most recent JobStart/Future Skills program, have you taken any additional education or training? What type of training did you take? (DO NOT READ)

(1/ 444 - 446 - 448 - 450 - 452)

No additional training ..... 00 => Q42X
Course at SIAST or Regional College 01
Further on the job training 02
University 03
Course with private trainer or community-based organization 04
Self-study 05
Other (SPECIFY) ..... 66 O

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Don't Know ..... 88 X => Q42X
No Response ..... 99 X => Q42X

00/11/30 12:13

66: **Q40**

Q40. Did this training build on your JobStart/Future Skills training, or was it in a different area?

(1/ 454)

Yes - built on previous training.....1
No - in a different area 2
Don't Know 8
No Response.....9

00/11/30 12:13

67: **Q41**

Q41. Has this training helped you find further employment or improved your position in the company? (NOTE: We are referring to the additional training)

(1/ 455)

Yes 1
No.....2
Don't Know 8
No Response.....9

68: **Q42X**

Q42X. I'd now like you to rate your experience in the JobStart/Future Skills program. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements. ----------> NEXT SCREEN TO CONTINUE

(1/ 456)

69: **Q42**

Q42. The training I received provided me with valuable skills for the job I was training for Do you agree or disagree with this statement? Is that strongly or somewhat agree/disagree?

(1/ 457)

Strongly agree 4
Somewhat agree 3
Somewhat disagree.....2
Strongly disagree.....1
Don't Know 8
No Response.....9

70: **Q43**

Q43. The training I received provided me with valuable skills for my long term career path Do you agree or disagree with this statement? Is that strongly or somewhat agree/disagree?

(1/ 458)

Strongly agree 4
Somewhat agree 3
Somewhat disagree.....2
Strongly disagree.....1
Don't Know 8
No Response.....9

71: **Q44**

Q44. The training has made it easier to find work Do you agree or disagree with this statement? Is that strongly or somewhat agree/disagree?

(1/ 459)

Strongly agree 4
Somewhat agree 3
Somewhat disagree.....2
Strongly disagree.....1
Don't Know 8
No Response.....9

72: **Q45**

Q45. My skills have increased as a result of the training I received Do you agree or disagree with this statement? Is that strongly or somewhat agree/disagree?

(1/ 460)

Strongly agree 4
Somewhat agree 3
Somewhat disagree.....2
Strongly disagree.....1
Don't Know 8
No Response.....9

73: **Q46**

Q46. My average annual earnings have increased as a result of the JobStart/Future Skills training program Do you agree or disagree with this statement? Is that strongly or somewhat agree/disagree?

(1/ 461)

Strongly agree 4
Somewhat agree 3
Somewhat disagree.....2
Strongly disagree.....1
Don't Know 8
No Response.....9

74: **Q47**

Q47. Overall, I am satisfied with the JobStart/Future Skills training program Do you agree or disagree with this statement? Is that strongly or somewhat agree/disagree?

(1/ 462)

Strongly agree 4
Somewhat agree 3
Somewhat disagree.....2
Strongly disagree.....1
Don't Know 8
No Response.....9

00/11/30 12:17

75: **Q48**

Q48. Based on your experiences, what are the main strengths of the training or course that you took? (DO NOT READ)

(1/ 463 - 465 - 467)

Certification	01	
Training provided at the worksite	02	
Good work experience	03	
Helps unemployed people find work	04	
Training is practical	05	
Provides access in rural communities	06	
Nothing	00	X
Other (SPECIFY)	66	O
_____		
_____		
_____		
Don't Know	88	X
No Response	99	X

00/11/30 12:17

76: **Q49**

Q49. Based on your experiences, what if anything about the JobStart/Future Skills program could be improved? (DO NOT READ)

(1/ 469 - 471 - 473 - 475 - 477)

Better training on the job	01	
Training in industry where there are jobs	02	
Better supervision	03	
Longer training period	04	
Other (SPECIFY)	66	O
_____		
_____		
_____		
_____		
_____		
Nothing	00	X
Don't Know	88	X
No Response	99	X

77: **Q50X**

[redacted]

Q50X. I'd now like to ask you a couple of general questions about your employment before and after participating in the JobStart/Future Skills program. --
----------> NEXT SCREEN TO CONTINUE

(1/ 479)

00/11/30 12:23

78: **Q50**

Q50. Please think about the 12 month period prior to beginning your first Job Start program. During this period, how many months had you been employed (full or part-time)?

(1/ 480)

$R 1 12
0 months employed 00
Don't Know 88
No Response 99

00/11/30 12:22

79: **Q51**

=> +1 if Q50=00

Q51. During this period, what was your average, hourly wage (per hour)? (NOTE: 12 months prior to your Job Start Program)

(1/ 482)

$R.1 0.50 50.00
Don't Know 88888
No Response 99999

00/11/30 12:22

80: **Q52**

Q52. During this 12 month period, did you receive Social Assistance? If so, for how many months?

(1/ 487)

$R 1 12
0 months on Social Assistance 00
Don't Know 88
No Response 99

81: **Q53**

=> +1 if NOT Q52=00

Q53. Were you on Social Assistance at any time prior to participating in the JobStart/Future Skills program? (NOTE: THIS REFERS TO ANY TIME IN THEIR LIFE)

(1/ 489)

Yes 1
No 2
Don't Know 8
No Response 9

00/11/30 12:24

82: **Q54**

Q54. During this 12 month period, did you receive EI (or UI)? If so, for how many months?

(1/ 490)

$R 1 12
0 months on EI 00

00/11/30 12:24

83: **Q55**

=> +1 if NOT Q54=00

Q55. Did you receive EI (or UI) at any time prior to participating in the JobStart program? (NOTE: THIS REFERS TO ANY TIME IN THEIR LIFE)

(1/ 492)

Yes 1
No 2
Don't Know 8
No Response 9

00/11/30 12:24

84: **Q56X**

=> Q60 if Q7=2 OR Q22=2

Q56X. I'd now like to focus on the period following the completion of your most recent JobStart / Future Skills training program. ----------> NEXT SCREEN TO CONTINUE

(1/ 493)

00/11/30 12:25

85: **Q56**

Q56. In the 12 months following your training, have you received Social Assistance? If so, for how many months? (FOR THOSE WHO DID NOT COMPLETE, TAKE FROM THE POINT OF THEM WITHDRAWING FROM THE PROGRAM)

(1/ 494)

$R 1 12
0 months on Social Assistance 00

00/11/30 12:25

86: **Q57**

=> +1 if NOT Q56=00

Q57. Were you on Social Assistance at any time after completing your JobStart program? (NOTE: THIS REFERS TO ANY TIME AFTER TAKING THE PROGRAM)

(1/ 496)

Yes 1
No.....2
Don't Know 8
No Response.....9

00/11/30 12:26

87: **Q58**

Q58. During this period, have you received EI? If so, for how many months? (FOR THOSE WHO DID NOT COMPLETE, TAKE FROM THE POINT OF THEM WITHDRAWING FROM THE PROGRAM - WE ARE REFERRING TO 12 MONTHS FOLLOWING THE PROGRAM)

(1/ 497)

$R 1 12
0 months on EI 00

00/11/30 12:27

88: **Q59**

=> +1 if NOT Q58=00

Q59. Were you on EI at any time after completing your JobStart/Future Skills program? (NOTE: THIS REFERS TO ANY TIME AFTER TAKING THE PROGRAM)

(1/ 499)

Yes 1
No.....2
Don't Know 8
No Response.....9

00/11/30 12:29

89: **Q60**

Q60. I'd now like to ask you a few questions about supports that you might have received prior to beginning your JobStart program. Did you ever develop a career/action plan with a teacher, counsellor, social worker, or by yourself? (e.g. a plan outlining the courses or skills that you would need to help you find employment?)

(1/ 500)

Yes 1
No.....2 => Q65
Don't Know .....8 => Q65
No Response.....9 => Q65

90: **Q61**

Q61. What is the current status of your career/action plan? Is it completed, are you part way through but still proceeding, did you stop before it ended, or have you never started?

(1/ 501)

Completed 4
Still proceeding 3
Stopped before it ended 2
Never started 1
Don't Know 8
No Response 9

91: **Q62**

Q62. How helpful was it in making plans for your future? (READ)

(1/ 502)

Very helpful 4
Somewhat helpful 3
Not very helpful 2
Not at all helpful 1
Don't Know 8
No Response 9

92: **Q63**

Q63. Have you ever used career counselling?

(1/ 503)

Yes 1
No 2
Don't Know 8
No Response 9

93: **Q64**

=> +1 if NOT Q63=1

Q64. Did it help you when making plans for your future? (READ)

(1/ 504)

Very helpful 4
Somewhat helpful 3
Not very helpful 2
Not at all helpful 1
Don't Know 8
No Response 9

94: **Q65**

Q65. Were there any other support services that might have helped you either prior to training, or while in training? (DO NOT READ)

(1/ 505 - 507 - 509 - 511 - 513)

Personal/financial counselling	01	
Tutoring	02	
Access to computers	03	
Better information about the job market	04	
Career planning	05	
Family support	06	
Employer support	07	
None	00	X
Other (SPECIFY)	66	O
_____		
_____		
_____		
_____		
_____		
Don't Know	88	X
No Response	99	X

95: **Q66X**

[redacted]

Q66X. I'd now like to ask you a couple of questions about information that you may have used when looking for work or researching potential occupations or industries. ----------> NEXT SCREEN TO CONTINUE

(1/ 515)

96: **Q66**

Q66. Have you ever used the resources at the Canada-Saskatchewan Career and Employment Services Centre to help you look for work or research an occupation or industry?

(1/ 516)

Yes	1	
No	2	=> Q68
Don't Know	8	=> Q68
No Response	9	=> Q68

97: **Q67**

Q67. How effective were these resources at meeting your needs? Were they... (READ)

(1/ 517)

Very effective	4
Somewhat effective	3
Ineffective	2
Very ineffective	1
Don't Know	8
No Response	9

98: **Q68**

Q68. Can you think of any other resource or agency that has helped you in getting training or trying to find work? (DO NOT READ)

(1/ 518 - 520 - 522 - 524 - 526)

Social Services	01	
HRDC	02	
New Careers	03	
Support from SIAST/Regional College teacher or counsellor	04	
Family / friends	05	
Other (SPECIFY)	66	O
_____		
_____		
_____		
_____		
_____		
None / Can't think of any	00	X
Don't Know	88	X
No Response	99	X

99: **Q69X**

[redacted]

Q69X. Finally, I'd like to ask you a few background questions. We use this information to make sure that the people we are talking with are representative of program participants in general. ----------> NEXT SCREEN TO CONTINUE

(1/ 528)

100: **Q69**

Q69. How did you find out about the JobStart/Future Skills program? (DO NOT READ)

(1/ 529 - 531 - 533 - 535 - 537)

Word of mouth	01	
Newspaper	02	
Radio	03	
Training deliverer/Vocational School	04	
Can-Sask Career and Employment Services staff	05	
From an employer	06	
SIAST or Regional College staff	07	
Friend or relative	08	
Social worker	09	
HRDC staff	10	
Community Based organization (YMCA, Searches)	11	
Government Department	12	
Government web-site	13	
Other (SPECIFY)	66	O
_____		
_____		
_____		
_____		
_____		
Don't Know	88	X
No Response	99	X

101: **Q70**

Q70. In what year were you born?

(1/ 539)

$R 1935 1985

No Response 8888

102: **AGE**

=> * if IF((NOT Q70=8888), 2000-Q70)

(1/ 543)

00/11/30 12:32

103: **Q71**

Q71. What was the highest level of formal education that you had completed prior to your course?

(1/ 545)

Grade 8 or less	01	
Some high school	02	
Graduated high school	03	
Some SIAST/Regional College	04	
Some university	05	
Graduated SIAST/Regional College	06	
Graduated university	07	
Other (SPECIFY)	66	O
_____		
_____		
_____		
Don't Know	88	X
No Response	99	X

00/12/01 13:45

104: **Q72**

Q72. Do you consider yourself...? (READ - CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

(1/ 547 - 548 - 549)

A member of a visible minority	1	
An aboriginal or Metis person	2	
A person with a disability	3	
(DO NOT READ) No / None of the above	0	X
(DO NOT READ) Don't Know	8	X
(DO NOT READ) No Response	9	X

00/11/30 10:59

105: **Q73**

=> +1 if NOT Q72=2

Q73. Are you of Aboriginal descent?

(1/ 550)

Status / Treaty Indian	1
Non-Status Indian	2
Metis	3
Inuit	4
No - Not aboriginal	0
Don't Know	8
No Response	9

00/11/29 15:26

106: **Q74**

Q74. What is your current family status? (NOTE: We are referring to children living in the household)

(1/ 551)

Single - no children 1
Single - with children 2
Couple (married, common-law) - no children 3
Couple (married, common-law) - with children 4
Don't Know 8
No Response 9

00/12/01 13:41

107: **Q75**

Q75. I'm now going to mention a number of income categories. When I come to the category that best describes your total family annual income, please stop me.

(1/ 552)

Under $10,000 1
$10,000 to $20,000 2
$20,000 to $30,000 3
$30,000 to $40,000 4
$40,000 to $50,000 5
Above $50,000 6
Don't Know 8
No Response 9

108: **Q76**

Q76. Do you have any final comments about the JobStart / Future Skills Program?

(1/ 553 - 555 - 557 - 559 - 561)

Comments .....66 O

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

No Comments .....00 X

109: **GENDR**

Thank you for the time and help you have given. It is very much appreciated!
(RECORD GENDER - DO NOT READ)

(1/ 563)

Male .....1 => INT
Female .....2 => INT
DK .....8 => INT

110: **INT**

[redacted]

CALL STATUS CODES: ENTER THE CALL RESULT ---------- END OF SURVEY ----------

(1/ 564 - 566 - 568 - 570 - 572 - 574)

Completion	01	CD	=> END
Hard appointment	04	R	=> NAME
Soft appointment	05	R	=> NAME
Not in service	10		=> END
Fax/Modem line	11		=> END
Business line	12		=> END
Household refusal	20		=> END
Respondent refusal	21		=> END
Respondent cannot be reached at this number / any number / Respondent not known by anyone at this address	22		=> END
Refusal at introduction	23		=> END
Termination - Mid interview	24		=> END
Busy	30	R	=> END
No answer	31	R	=> END
Answering machine	32	R	=> END
Other	50	RO	=> END
Language/Heath/Hearing problem	60		=> END
Non-qualified respondent	70		=> END

111: **F6**

[redacted]

NOTES.

(1/ 576 - 577 - 578)

INTERVIEWER COMMENTS ..... 1 DO

_____

_____

_____

112: **F10**

PRA is an independent research company. We provide impartial investigation of public policy issues, conduct research in the social sciences, and provide training and consulting services. If you have any questions regarding this survey, you may call Greg Mason, of Prairie Research Associates, toll-free at 1-888-877-6744.

----------> NEXT SCREEN TO RETURN TO SURVEY

(1/ 579)

RECORD CALLBACK INFORMATION HERE:

NAME: @NAME

INFORMATION: @INFO1

@INFO2

113: **NAME**

[redacted]

May I please have the name of the person I should ask for when calling back?

(1/ 580)

$P

114: **INFO1**

[redacted]

(1/ 610)

115: **INFO2**

[redacted]

(1/ 670)

116: **CB**

=> END if $A > 20

[redacted]

When would be the best time to call back?

(1/ 0)

$CHS

APPENDIX B
STAFF SURVEY

Survey of PSEST and CES Staff

JobStart/Future Skills Program

The Saskatchewan Department of Post-Secondary Education and Skills Training has contracted with PRA Inc. (an independent research company) to evaluate the JobStart/Future Skills Program.

This survey gathers the opinions of PSEST / CES staff who have experience administrating the JobStart/Future Skills Program. Given your first hand experience with the Program, your responses are very important to us.

Your responses will be kept confidential within PRA Inc.
All information will be grouped together in reports, and no individual responses will be identifiable.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read each question carefully and check (✓) or write in the appropriate response.
Return your completed questionnaire by Toll Free Fax (1-800-717-5456) or in the envelope provided.

Part A: Program effectiveness – Quick Skills

1. Please think about the Quick Skills Program, which provides short-term, credit training to meet immediate industry needs for qualified employers. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not sure
Quick Skills courses reflect industry demand	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Quick Skills courses are being offered in the right industry sectors	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Quick Skills training meets employers' needs	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Quick Skills training meets trainees' needs	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Most Quick Skills trainees have identified potential employers prior to their training	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
SIAST / Regional Colleges have identified potential employers prior to training	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Quick Skills trainees are well positioned to find work following course completion	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Quick Skills trainees receive sufficient income support while in training	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Quick Skills is a necessary program	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8

2. What are the main strengths of the Quick Skills Program? Why?

_____

_____

_____

3. In what ways, if any, could the Quick Skills Program be improved?

_____

_____

_____

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read each question carefully and check (✓) or write in the appropriate response. Return your completed questionnaire by Toll Free Fax (1-800-717-5456) or in the envelope provided.

Part B: Program effectiveness – Work-Based Training for unemployed/employed

4. Please think about the Work-Based Training for the Unemployed Program, which provides recognized on-the-job training for unemployed Saskatchewan residents to become permanently employed in the workplace. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not sure
Employers receive sufficient financial support to provide Work-Based Training	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Work-Based Training subsidies per trainee should not be set at a fixed maximum amount ($5,000)	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Work-Based Training subsidies per employer should not be set at a fixed maximum amount ($100,000)	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Work-Based Training meets trainees' needs	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Work-Based Training meets employers' needs	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Providing credit for Work-Based Training is important	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Work-Based Training provides trainees with meaningful employment	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Trainees are well positioned to maintain employment after program completion	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Work-Based Training helps cultivate a learning culture among employers	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Work-Based Training is a necessary program	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8

5. What are the main strengths of the Work-Based Training for the Unemployed Program?

_____

_____

6. In what ways, if any, could the Work-Based Training for the Unemployed Program be improved?

_____

_____

7. Do you think that the Work-Based Training for the employed (i.e., retraining, up-skilling) component of the JobStart/Future Skills Program should be brought back?

O1 Yes, bring it back O2 Maybe, it is beneficial but not necessary O3 No, the program is not needed O8 Don't know

8. Why do you think that the Work-Based Training for the Employed Program is/is not necessary?

_____

_____

_____

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read each question carefully and check (✓) or write in the appropriate response. Return your completed questionnaire by Toll Free Fax (1-800-717-5456) or in the envelope provided.

Part C: Overall evaluation of the JobStart/Future Skills Program

9. Now, please think about the JobStart/Future Skills Program as a whole. How important are the following characteristics of the Program?

	Very important	Somewhat important	Neutral	Not important	Not at all important	Not sure
Providing credited training	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Recognizing previous learning and experience and establishing credit for it	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Giving employers the ability to decide who to hire	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Quick processing of program application	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Employer involvement in planning and recruiting	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Regional decision-making	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Local decision-making	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Flexibility to design a training program to meet employers' training needs	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8

10. Is credit for training important to employers?

O1 Yes – Why? _____

O0 No – Why not? _____

11. Should the approval process be changed to ensure greater consistency across regions?

O1 Yes – Why? _____

O0 No – Why not? _____

O8 Not sure

12. The JobStart/Future Skills Program was introduced to assist in achieving the following goals. Please indicate how well these goals are being met.

	Goal fully met	Goal partially met	Goal not met	Not sure
Developing a skilled workforce relevant to Saskatchewan's labour market	O3	O2	O1	O8
Enhancing access and support for learners	O3	O2	O1	O8
Creating a coherent, effective, and sustainable delivery system	O3	O2	O1	O8

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read each question carefully and check (✓) or write in the appropriate response. Return your completed questionnaire by Toll Free Fax (1-800-717-5456) or in the envelope provided.

13. Please indicate which of the following groups, if any, are under-represented in JobStart/Future Skills Programs.

O$_1$ Social Assistance recipients	O$_2$ EI recipients (active or "reachback")	O$_3$ First Nations
O$_4$ Metis	O$_5$ Visible minorities	O$_6$ Youth (Under 25)
O$_7$ Persons with disabilities	O$_8$ None	O$_9$ Not sure

14. In what way, if any, should the JobStart/Future Skills Program be modified to improve access for the under-represented groups identified above?

O$_8$ No change needed O$_9$ Not sure

Suggested change: _____

_____

_____

_____

15. In what way, if any, should the JobStart/Future Skills Program be modified to improve the development of a skilled workforce relevant to Saskatchewan's labour market?

O$_8$ No change needed O$_9$ Not sure

Suggested change: _____

_____

_____

_____

16. In what way, if any, should the JobStart/Future Skills Program be modified to improve the creation of a coherent, effective and sustainable delivery system?

O$_8$ No change needed O$_9$ Not sure

Suggested change: _____

_____

_____

_____

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read each question carefully and check (✓) or write in the appropriate response. Return your completed questionnaire by Toll Free Fax (1-800-717-5456) or in the envelope provided.

Part D: Administration and program planning

17. Please rate the effectiveness of the following administrative processes in your region.

	Effective as is	Needs some improvement	Needs major improvement	Not sure
Preparing local/regional needs assessments	O3	O2	O1	O8
Identifying training needs through Sector Partnerships	O3	O2	O1	O8
Assisting employers with proposals	O3	O2	O1	O8
Monitoring trainees' progress while in training	O3	O2	O1	O8
Communicating with employers who have never participated	O3	O2	O1	O8
Processing trainee applications for Quick Skills Programs	O3	O2	O1	O8
Processing trainee applications for Work-Based Training Programs	O3	O2	O1	O8
Tracking trainees' outcomes	O3	O2	O1	O8
Tracking employers' outcomes	O3	O2	O1	O8

18. Do you have any suggestions for improving the local/regional training needs assessment process?

O0 No change needed O8 Not sure

Suggested change: _____

_____

_____

19. How does the work done under the Sector Partnerships programs assist in the local/regional planning process?

O0 Does not help O8 Not sure

Way that it assists: _____

_____

_____

20. Do you have any suggestions for improving the Sector Partnerships program?

O0 No change needed O8 Not sure

Suggested change: _____

_____

_____

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read each question carefully and check (✓) or write in the appropriate response. Return your completed questionnaire by Toll Free Fax (1-800-717-5456) or in the envelope provided.

21. Do you have any suggestions for improving program planning and administration?

O₀ No change needed O₁ Not sure

Suggested change: _____

_____

_____

_____

22. How could the relationship between SIAST/Regional Colleges and Career and Employment Services be improved, if at all?

O₀ No change needed O₁ Not sure

Suggested change: _____

_____

_____

23. How could the relationship between SIAST/Regional Colleges and PSEST be improved, if at all?

O₀ No change needed O₁ Not sure

Suggested change: _____

_____

_____

Part E: Communication and marketing

24. Are current marketing approaches adequate to reach trainees?

O₁ Yes, there is enough O₂ Yes, but more would help O₃ No, more is needed O₄ Don't know

25. How can program marketing to trainees be improved?

O₁ More funding from PSEST for marketing
O₂ More marketing by PSEST
O₃ More responsibility given to SIAST/RC to market the program
O₄ More direct marketing by community-based organizations
O₅ Better marketing of all provincial training programs
O₆ More client referrals from Can-Sask
O₀ Nothing is needed
O₇ Not sure

Other (Specify) _____

_____

_____

_____

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read each question carefully and check (✓) or write in the appropriate response. Return your completed questionnaire by Toll Free Fax (1-800-717-5456) or in the envelope provided.

26. Are current marketing approaches adequate to reach employers?

O$_1$ Yes, there is enough O$_2$ Yes, but more would help O$_3$ No, more is needed O$_4$ Don't know

27. How can program marketing to employers be improved?

O$_1$ More funding from PSEST for marketing
O$_2$ More marketing by PSEST
O$_3$ More responsibility given to SIAST/RC to market the program
O$_4$ More direct marketing by employers
O$_5$ Better marketing of all provincial training programs
O$_6$ More referrals from Can-Sask
O$_7$ Nothing is needed
O$_8$ Not sure

Other (Specify) _____

_____

_____

_____

28. Do you have any additional comments about the JobStart/Future Skills Program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

PRA
Prairie Research Associates Inc.
500 – 363 Broadway
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3C 3N9

You can fax it back to us toll-free at:

1-800-717-5456

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read each question carefully and check (✓) or write in the appropriate response. Return your completed questionnaire by Toll Free Fax (1-800-717-5456) or in the envelope provided.

Survey of SIAST and Regional College Staff

JobStart/Future Skills Program

The Saskatchewan Department of Post-Secondary Education and Skills Training has contracted with PRA Inc. (an independent research company) to evaluate the JobStart/Future Skills Program.

This survey gathers the opinions of SIAST and Regional College staff who have experience administrating the JobStart/Future Skills Program. Given your first hand experience with the Program, your responses are very important to us.

Your responses will be kept confidential within PRA Inc.
All information will be grouped together in reports, and no individual responses will be identifiable.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read each question carefully and check (✓) or write in the appropriate response. Return your completed questionnaire by Toll Free Fax (1-800-717-5456) or in the envelope provided.

Part A: Program effectiveness – Quick Skills

1. Please think about the Quick Skills Program, which provides short-term, credit training to meet immediate industry needs for qualified employers. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not sure
Quick Skills courses reflect industry demand	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Quick Skills courses are being offered in the right industry sectors	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Quick Skills training meets employers' needs	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Quick Skills training meets trainees' needs	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Most Quick Skills trainees have identified potential employers prior to their training	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
SIAST / Regional Colleges have identified potential employers prior to training	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Quick Skills trainees are well positioned to find work following course completion	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Quick Skills trainees receive sufficient income support while in training	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8
Quick Skills is a necessary program	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O8

2. What are the main strengths of the Quick Skills Program? Why?

_____

_____

_____

3. In what ways, if any, could the Quick Skills Program be improved?

_____

_____

_____

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read each question carefully and check (✓) or write in the appropriate response. Return your completed questionnaire by Toll Free Fax (1-800-717-5456) or in the envelope provided.

Part B: Program effectiveness – Work-Based Training for unemployed/employed

4. Please think about the Work-Based Training for the Unemployed Program, which provides recognized on-the-job training for unemployed Saskatchewan residents to become permanently employed in the workplace. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not sure
Employers receive sufficient financial support to provide Work-Based Training	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6
Work-Based Training subsidies per trainee should not be set at a fixed maximum amount ($5,000)	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6
Work-Based Training subsidies per employer should not be set at a fixed maximum amount ($100,000)	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6
Work-Based Training meets trainees' needs	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6
Work-Based Training meets employers' needs	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6
Providing credit for Work-Based Training is important	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6
Work-Based Training provides trainees with meaningful employment	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6
Trainees are well positioned to maintain employment after program completion	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6
Work-Based Training helps cultivate a learning culture among employers	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6
Work-Based Training is a necessary program	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6

5. What are the main strengths of the Work-Based Training for the Unemployed Program?

_____

_____

6. In what ways, if any, could the Work-Based Training for the Unemployed Program be improved?

_____

_____

7. Do you think that the Work-Based Training for the employed (i.e., retraining, up-skilling) component of the JobStart/Future Skills Program should be brought back?

O1 Yes, bring it back O2 Maybe, it is beneficial but not necessary O3 No, the program is not needed O4 Don't know

8. Why do you think that the Work-Based Training for the Employed Program is/is not necessary?

_____

_____

_____

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read each question carefully and check (✓) or write in the appropriate response. Return your completed questionnaire by Toll Free Fax (1-800-717-5456) or in the envelope provided.

Part C: Overall evaluation of the JobStart/Future Skills Program

9. Now, please think about the JobStart/Future Skills Program as a whole. How important are the following characteristics of the Program?

	Very important	Somewhat important	Neutral	Not important	Not at all important	Not sure
Providing credited training	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O9
Recognizing previous learning and experience and establishing credit for it	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O9
Giving employers the ability to decide who to hire	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O9
Quick processing of program application	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O9
Employer involvement in planning and recruiting	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O9
Regional decision-making	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O9
Local decision-making	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O9
Flexibility to design a training program to meet employers' training needs	O5	O4	O3	O2	O1	O9

10. Is credit for training important to employers?

O1 Yes – Why? _____

O2 No – Why not? _____

11. Should the approval process be changed to ensure greater consistency across regions?

O1 Yes – Why? _____

O2 No – Why not? _____

O9 Not sure

12. The JobStart/Future Skills Program was introduced to assist in achieving the following goals. Please indicate how well these goals are being met.

	Goal fully met	Goal partially met	Goal not met	Not sure
Developing a skilled workforce relevant to Saskatchewan's labour market	O3	O2	O1	O9
Enhancing access and support for learners	O3	O2	O1	O9
Creating a coherent, effective, and sustainable delivery system	O3	O2	O1	O9

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read each question carefully and check (✓) or write in the appropriate response. Return your completed questionnaire by Toll Free Fax (1-800-717-5456) or in the envelope provided.

13. Please indicate which of the following groups, if any, are under-represented in JobStart/Future Skills Programs.

O1 Social Assistance recipients	O2 EI recipients (active or "reachback")	O3 First Nations
O4 Metis	O5 Visible minorities	O6 Youth (Under 25)
O7 Persons with disabilities	O8 None	O9 Not sure

14. In what way, if any, should the JobStart/Future Skills Program be modified to improve access for the under-represented groups identified above?

O8 No change needed O9 Not sure

Suggested change: _____

_____

_____

_____

15. In what way, if any, should the JobStart/Future Skills Program be modified to improve the development of a skilled workforce relevant to Saskatchewan's labour market?

O8 No change needed O9 Not sure

Suggested change: _____

_____

_____

_____

16. In what way, if any, should the JobStart/Future Skills Program be modified to improve the creation of a coherent, effective and sustainable delivery system?

O8 No change needed O9 Not sure

Suggested change: _____

_____

_____

_____

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read each question carefully and check (✓) or write in the appropriate response. *Return your completed questionnaire by Toll Free Fax (1-800-717-5456) or in the envelope provided.*

Part D: Administration and program planning

17. Please rate the effectiveness of the following administrative processes at your institution.

	Effective as is	Needs some improvement	Needs major improvement	Not sure
Preparing local/regional needs assessments	O3	O2	O1	O8
Assisting employers with proposals	O3	O2	O1	O8
Monitoring trainees' progress while in training	O3	O2	O1	O8
Communicating with employers who have never participated	O3	O2	O1	O8
Processing trainee applications for Quick Skills Programs	O3	O2	O1	O8
Processing trainee applications for Work-Based Training Programs	O3	O2	O1	O8
Tracking trainees' outcomes	O3	O2	O1	O8
Tracking employers' outcomes	O3	O2	O1	O8

18. Do you have any suggestions for improving the local/regional training needs assessment process?

O9 No change needed O8 Not sure

Suggested change: _____

_____

_____

19. How does the work done under the Sector Partnerships programs assist in the local/regional planning process?

O9 Does not help O8 Not sure

Way that it assists: _____

_____

_____

20. Do you have any suggestions for improving the Sector Partnerships program?

O9 No change needed O8 Not sure

Suggested change: _____

_____

_____

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read each question carefully and check (✓) or write in the appropriate response. Return your completed questionnaire by Toll Free Fax (1-800-717-5458) or in the envelope provided.

21. Do you have any suggestions for improving program planning and administration?

O₀ No change needed O₁ Not sure

Suggested change: _____

_____

_____

_____

22. How could the relationship between SIAST/Regional Colleges and Career and Employment Services be improved, if at all?

O₀ No change needed O₁ Not sure

Suggested change: _____

_____

_____

23. How could the relationship between SIAST/Regional Colleges and PSEST be improved, if at all?

O₀ No change needed O₁ Not sure

Suggested change: _____

_____

_____

Part E: Communication and marketing

24. Are current marketing approaches adequate to reach trainees?

O₁ Yes, there is enough O₂ Yes, but more would help O₃ No, more is needed O₄ Don't know

25. How can program marketing to trainees be improved?

O₁ More funding from PSEST for marketing
O₂ More marketing by PSEST
O₃ More responsibility given to SIAST/RC to market the program
O₄ More direct marketing by community-based organizations
O₅ Better marketing of all provincial training programs
O₆ More client referrals from Can-Sask
O₀ Nothing is needed
O₇ Not sure

Other (Specify) _____

_____

_____

_____

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read each question carefully and check (✓) or write in the appropriate response. Return your completed questionnaire by Toll Free Fax (1-800-717-5456) or in the envelope provided.

26. Are current marketing approaches adequate to reach employers?

O$_1$ Yes, there is enough O$_2$ Yes, but more would help O$_3$ No, more is needed O$_4$ Don't know

27. How can program marketing to employers be improved?

O$_1$ More funding from PSEST for marketing
O$_2$ More marketing by PSEST
O$_3$ More responsibility given to SIAST/RC to market the program
O$_4$ More direct marketing by employers
O$_5$ Better marketing of all provincial training programs
O$_6$ More referrals from Can-Sask
O$_7$ Nothing is needed
O$_8$ Not sure

Other (Specify) _____

28. Do you have any additional comments about the JobStart/Future Skills Program?

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

PRA
Prairie Research Associates Inc.
500 – 363 Broadway
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3C 3N9

You can fax it back to us toll-free at:

1-800-717-5456

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read each question carefully and check (✓) or write in the appropriate response. Return your completed questionnaire by Toll Free Fax (1-800-717-5456) or in the envelope provided.

APPENDIX C
KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE

Job Start/Future Skills Key Informant Interview Guide

Purpose of the Interview

This set of interviews focuses on individuals who are involved with the overall management of Job Start/Future Skills (JS/FS), Work-Based Training, Quickskills, Work-based Retraining and Sector Partnerships. These programs are referred to generically here as Job Start/Future Skills Programs. These interviews will offer evaluators a more complete understanding of JS/FS and will assist in the development of client, staff and employer surveys.

1. What is your job position? How are you involved with Job Start/Future Skills? How long have you been involved with the program?

RATIONALE

2. How would you describe the relevance of JS/FS programs to the needs of:
   - trainees
   - employers
   - industry as a whole and
   - community partners?

3. How does the design and delivery of JS/FS reflect the guidelines, principles and intent of the Saskatchewan Training Strategy and the PSEST Sector Plan?

4. How does Job Start/Future Skills meet a training need or fill an existing gap?

PROGRAM DESIGN AND DELIVERY

5. How are training needs identified for your region or the province as a whole? Please describe the process for completing local / regional training needs assessments. What is your role in sector and regional human resource planning.

6. What changes, if any, should be made to this process? Why? Can you cite an example of a particularly effective assessment process? What made it effective?

7. How do regional needs assessments lead to a regional plan? Is this process effective?

8. Are Job Start/Future Skills programs reflective of the goals, objectives and results of regional planning?

9. To what extent is there involvement of community partners? To what extent have Job Start/Future Skills programs led to the development of partnerships/enhancement of existing partnerships among orders of government, employers, industry, Aboriginal and community partners?

10. How well do industry associations, community partners, and training institutions work together to meet training and employment needs specific to an industry or sector? How reflective is the representation in serving the region, industry, community partners?

11. How effective are public training providers in responding quickly to industry needs for skilled workers? How does industry communicate its needs to public training providers?

12. How flexible and responsive is the curriculum/course design and delivery in meeting individual, community partners, employer and industry needs? What examples are there that show flexibility and responsiveness in meeting employer and employee needs?

13. What role does work-based training play in the training system and what should be the role?

14. What roles should community-based organizations and private trainers play in the training system?

Program Design/Delivery (Relation to other programming)

15. How do Job Start/Future Skills programs relate to other labour market training programs such as Bridging, Work Placement, and other programs under the LMDA? What unique role does it fulfill?

16. To what extent is there overlap / duplication / integration with other programs? What gaps exist, if any?

Program Design/Delivery (Marketing/Promotion)

17. To what extent is the current approach to communicating Job Start/Future Skills programs to individuals, employers, industry, and communities appropriate and effective? What changes would you suggest?

Success/Impacts

18. How do employers support training under the Job Skills/Future Start programs?

19. What reaction have employers had to the cancellation of Work-Based Training for the Employed?

20. What should be the critical indicators of success for Job Skills/Future Start programs?

Cost Effectiveness

21. Are levels of provincial financial support adequate? Why or why not?

22. Compared to other labour market training programs, does Job Start/Future Skills represent good value? Why or why not?

23. Overall is the program cost effective? Is the program cost appropriate in comparison to other similar programs?

Alternatives

24. Can you identify best practices/lessons learned as they relate to:

- Designated groups
- Employers
- Industry
- Community partners?

25. Are there more effective ways to deliver training programs and services that support social and economic development?

26. Do you have any other comments about the Job Start/Future Skills?

APPENDIX D
LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

JobStart/Future Skills Evaluation - Key Informants

Contact	*Organization*
Gayle McMartin JS/FS Training Consultant	Carlton Trail Regional College
Valerie Mushinski Chief Executive Officer	Cumberland Regional College
Terry Gove Senior Academic Officer and IQR Contact	Cypress Hills Regional College
Ken Schaaf JS/FS Training Consultant	North West Regional College
Peter Mayotte Northlands Regional Director	Northlands College
Sonja Gehl Director of Human Resources & Organizational Development	Parkland Regional College
Elaine Ebenal JS/FS Training Consultant and IQR Contact	Prairie West Regional College
Helene Wilson Coordinator, Workbased Training Programs	Southeast Regional College
Barb Heise Director, Skills Initiatives	SIAST Administrative Office
Dalton Mervold Program Head, Parts Management	SIAST Kelsey Campus
Terri Thompson JS/FS Training Consultant IQR Contact	SIAST Kelsey Campus
Sheri Dickie JS/FS Training Consultant IQR Contact	SIAST Woodland Campus
Keith Landry Director, Region 4	Regional Services, PSEST
Carol Lumb Director, Tourism Education & Training	Saskatchewan Tourism and Education Council (STEC)
Lorne Bryden Director, Business Development	Economic and Co-operative Development
Gord Tweed Income Security Programs Manager	Social Services
Marcia Schoffer Manager, Career and Employment Services, Region 5	Regional Services, PSEST
Rick Pawliw Acting Executive Director, Programs Branch	Post-Secondary Education and Skills Training
Al Douglas Assistant Director, Industry Liaison	Apprenticeship and Trade Certification Commission
Sandra Greenough CHRP	Greenough & Associates Inc.
Rob Dewhurst Executive Director	Saskatchewan Motion Picture Association (SMPIA)
Hal Stupinkoff	Saskatchewan Outfitters Association

Contact	*Organization*
Jean Gabert R.S.B. Director	Canada-Saskatchewan Career and Employment Services
Ken McKinley Executive Director	Saskatchewan Home Builders Association
Luanne Lashyn	Saskatchewan Food Processors Association
Tim McQuaid Director of Training	Saskatchewan Trucking Association
Wayne McElree Assistant Deputy Minister	Post Secondary Education and Skills Training
Lily Stonehouse Assistant Deputy Minister	Post Secondary Education and Skills Training

APPENDIX E
METHODOLOGY

Issues	Questions	Data sources
Rationale	• To what extent are JS/FS programs relevant to the needs of the individual, employers, industry, and the community? • To what extent are the programs utilized, underutilized, oversubscribed, and by what type of participant/employer?	• Key informant interviews • Employer survey • Staff survey • Trainee survey • Database review
Program Design and Delivery	• Does the design and delivery of JS/FS reflect the guidelines, principles, and intent of the Saskatchewan Training Strategy and PSEST Sector Plan? • To what extent is there overlap / duplication / integration with other programs and services? • To what extent has the JS/FS Program led to the development of partnerships or the enhancement of existing partnerships? • To what extent is there local and regional decision making, and are decisions consistent across jurisdictions? • Is there regional variation in the types of employers and trainees? • What type of income support do trainees receive? • How flexible and responsive is program design and delivery in meeting individual, community, industry, and employer needs? • How effectively and efficiently is the program managed? • Is the program's cost appropriate in comparison to other similar programs?	• Key informant interviews • Employer survey • Staff survey • Trainee survey Database review Document review

Success / Impacts / Effects	• How many participants found, maintained, or changed employment or went on to further training? • To what extent has JS/FS had an impact on economic self-sufficiency? • How satisfied are participants with JS/FS training? • Do trainees complete case plans, and are they effective? • To what extent does JS/FS assist employers in meeting their needs, and how satisfied are they with programs? • How satisfied are employers and trainees with labour market information? • Did the program create any unintended positive or negative results?	• Key informant interviews • Employer survey • Staff survey • Trainee survey • Database review • Document review
Alternatives	• What "best practices / lessons learned" can be identified to assist the targeted participants? • Are there more effective ways to deliver training programs and services that support social and economic development?	• Key informant interviews • Employer survey • Staff survey • Trainee survey Database review Document review

APPENDIX F
SECTOR PARTNERSHIPS

Sector Partnership	Objectives	Participants
Apparel and Textile Association of Saskatchewan	analyze industry training needs identify skill gaps • recommend course content and delivery • identify the specific curriculum for technical and non-technical training	Industry representatives SIAST Dumont Technical Institute Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations (FSIN) Saskatchewan Economic and Cooperative Development
Saskatchewan Recording Industry Association	• assess industry trends by identifying current and future human resource and training needs • provide detailed analysis of existing training, educational programs and resources available in Saskatchewan and the rest of Canada • identify gaps in program content and accessibility • identify potential resources or partnerships • develop strategies for providing training and employment opportunities for First Nations and Métis people	Saskatchewan Recording Industry Association PSEST
Saskatchewan Motion Picture Association	• to determine the training and employment needs for the film, television, and new media industry • to identify the skills and training needs of women in the industry • to identify barriers to training and employment of First Nations and Métis people in the industry	Saskatchewan Motion Picture Association Saskatchewan Aboriginal Film and Video Art Alliance (SAFVAA) Saskatchewan Women in Film and Television (SWIFT) SaskFILM JobStart/Future Skills SIAST Saskatchewan Film Producers Association IATSE Local 295 and 300 Director's Guild of Canada (DGC)
Saskatchewan Export Manufacturing	• address immediate issues facing the industry, such as the inability to find skilled employees • identify skill gaps for existing employees and for training new people • identify future skill needs and develop strategies to address those needs • develop effective partnerships between the companies, training providers, and representative organizations and agencies • improve effectiveness of training and develop new approaches for the delivery of training	Saskatchewan Export Manufacturing Sector Partnership Steering Committee PSEST
Food Processing	• to identify human resource and training needs of the industry	Food Processing Sector Partnership Steering Committee Saskatchewan Indian Institute of Technologies Dumont Technical Institute Aboriginal Human Resources Development Council of Canada
Saskatchewan Forestry	• to identify human resource needs and develop strategies to address needs • to improve effectiveness of required training and develop new approaches for delivery • to develop partnerships between companies, training providers, and representative organizations • to provide an immediate forum for the industry to make decisions based on solid research and information.	Saskatchewan Forestry Sector Partnership Steering Committee (industry representatives and stakeholders); PSEST
Professional Outfitting Standards	• to identify, develop, and validate a set of industry standards • to develop strategies that address training needs • to identify existing industry training programs and other strategies recognizing partnerships with existing training providers and including First Nations and Métis people and organizations	Saskatchewan Outfitters Association Saskatchewan Post-Secondary Education and Skills Training Saskatchewan Environment and Resource Management Saskatchewan Economic and Cooperative Development Tourism Saskatchewan Saskatchewan Tourism Education Council (including First Nation/Métis

Sector Partnership	Objectives	Participants
		representation)
Prairie Implement Manufacturer's Association (PIMA)	• to identify training and skills needs of existing and new employees • to identify growth areas in the industry • to perform gap analysis of current and future training requirements • to identify training approaches that meet industry training needs	PIMA Sector Partnership Steering Committee Industry representatives and stakeholders TDR Human Resource Services Ltd. PSEST
1999 Report of the Saskatchewan Sectoral Council for Culture	• to conduct a comprehensive analysis of cultural training opportunities in Saskatchewan	SaskCulture Inc. Saskatchewan Sectoral Council for Culture ArtSchool Saskatchewan
Saskatchewan's Fire and Rescue Service Sector	• to identify short and long term human development needs within the fire/rescue sector and its sub-sectors • to gain input and recommendations on strategies for future development and delivery of education and training • to identify education and training needs within each sub-sector • to identify three projects to help the sector organize and move forward with their education and training agenda.	Saskatchewan Post Secondary Education and Skills Training Office of the Fire Commissioner Saskatchewan Municipal Affairs, Culture and Housing Members of Saskatchewan's fire/rescue sector
Saskatchewan Aviation	• to provide information to aid the aviation industry in undertaking human resource and training planning.	Saskatchewan Aviation Sector Partnership (industry representatives and stakeholders)
Saskatchewan Tourism Industry	• to identify training needs in the eight traditionally recognized sectors of tourism: food and beverage service, accommodation, travel trade, adventure tourism and recreation, events and conferences, tourism services, attractions, and transport. • To provide insight into tourism industry needs to training providers across the province.	Saskatchewan Tourism Education Council PSEST (Sector Partnership Program) Canadian Tourism Human Resource Council Sask Culture
Saskatchewan Trucking Sector Partnership	• to identify skills requirements and deficiencies, and to identify critical issues such as recruitment and retention • to identify the nature and scope of the industry's training needs	Saskatchewan Trucking Sector Partnership PSEST